
THE
PRINCIPLES
OF THE
LEADING QUAKERS

Truly REPRESENTED, &c.

8

THE
PRINCIPLES

OF THE

Leading Quakers

TRULY REPRESENTED

AS

Inconsistent with the Fundamental Doctrines
of the Christian Religion



VINDICATION

OF THE

Bishop of Exeter and Cornwall

FROM THE

CHARGE of Misrepresentation
Answers to a late LETTER to His
Lordship on that Occasion, by T. and
a pamphlet entitled, A Cloud of Witnesses, &c.
by J. &

LONDON:

Printed by James Knapton, near the Office of the
Commons, in Strand.

THE
PRINCIPLES

OF THE
Leading Quakers

TRULY REPRESENTED,

AS

Inconsistent with the Fundamental Doctrines
of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

OR, A

VINDICATION

OF THE

Bishop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*

FROM THE

CHARGE of Misrepresenting them; in
ANSWER to a late LETTER to His
Lordship on that Occasion, by T. S. and a
Pamphlet intituled, *A Cloud of Witnesses*, &c.
by J. B.

K

L O N D O N :

Printed for *James Roberts*, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *War-*
wick-Lane. 1732.

PHILADELPHIA
JAN 10 1876
J. B. Lippincott & Co.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
JAN 10 1876

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1876
J. B. Lippincott & Co.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
JAN 10 1876
J. B. Lippincott & Co.



T H E
P R I N C I P L E S
O F T H E
L E A D I N G Q U A K E R S

Truly Represented ; or, a Vindication of the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, &c.



IN order to understand the true State of the present Controversy, it is necessary to recur to the express, though incidental, Passages of the Bishop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*, in his late *Vindication of the Miracles of our Blessed Saviour* ; which, as they relate to the *Quakers*, have occasion'd the *Letter* to him, as likewise the *Cloud of*

Vol. 2.
Pref. p. 5, 6.
Book,
p. 57².

A *Witnesses*

Witnesses, in favour of them, that are now the Subjects of our Consideration. Mr. *Woolston*, in the *Third general Proposition* of his *Discourses on the Miracles of our Blessed Saviour*, pretended to shew, that when *Jesus* appeals to his Miracles as to a Testimony of his Authority, he could not, and did not, properly and ultimately refer to the Miracles done in the *Flesh*, but to those *mystical* ones he would do in the *Spirit*, of which those done in the *Flesh* are said to have been but mere *Types* and *Shadows*. And when it was Objected to Mr. *W.* that *Jesus* appealed to the Works he then did, and had done, in the *Flesh*, as a Witness of him; Mr. *W.* asks, "Why might not *Jesus* then *Prophecy*, " and mean the *Spiritual* Works that *He-in-us* would do?" To this the Bishop of *Lichfield* opposes several Reasons; the *Third* of which is, "That it is a gross Contradiction to assert, that any Person who is properly stiled, *He-without-us*, can possibly mean the Person who is here stiled, *He-within-us*." On which Occasion the Bishop immediately adds, "And indeed such a Confusion is so very Enthusiastical a thing, as to be capable of being defended only on the Principles of the *Familists* and *Quakers*; who have been deluded so

See Disc. I.
p. 4, &c.

Disc. 6.
p. 50, 51,
&c.

See *Vindica-*
tor. Vol.
II. p. 571,
&c.

* See Dr. *H. More's Grand Mystery of Godliness*, B. 6. c. 16, &c. as likewise Mr. *Lesley's Snake in the Grass*, Sect. 10. 12. *Defence*, part 1. p. 99. Part 2. p. 222, &c. *Reply*, Sect. 22. p. 316, &c.

" far

" far as to lose the *Belief* of a real *external*
 " *Jesus* by the *Christ* *within* them, and the
 " *literal* Resurrection of the former by the
 " *Spiritual* and *Moral* one of the latter;
 " an *Errour*, that is expressly condemned
 " by *St. Paul*." And again in the *Preface* ^{2 Tim. ii.}
 to his Second Volume, the B. of L. ^{18.}
 writes thus; " On this Occasion I might ^{p. 5.}
 " add, that the *Enthusiastical* Pretensions of
 " *David George* and *Henry Nicholas*, the
 " Heads of the *Familists*, and of *George*
 " *Fox*, and other Heads of the *Quakers*,
 " (the latter of whom borrowed their *My-*
 " *stical* Scheme from the former) were in
 " *many* *Respects* the very *same* with those
 " that have been lately vamped up by
 " *Mr. W.* namely, They *Allegorized* away
 " the Letter of the New Testament, by
 " *opposing*, or at least *preferring*, a *Spiritual*
 " or *inward* *Christ* to a *literal*, *Historical*,
 " and *outward* *Jesus*; and that in all the
 " the Circumstances of his Birth, Life,
 " Death, Resurrection, and Ascension;
 " about the *Letter* of which they wrote
 " with Contempt.---- I am far, however,
 " from condemning the *Quakers* as *Deists*,
 " since many of that Sect have been, and
 " no doubt now are, well-meaning though
 " ignorant Persons, that have been imposed
 " on by their Leaders: but I cannot ac-
 " quit the *Founders* and *Heads* of that Sect
 " from having been *Deists* in an *Allegori-*
 " *cal* Disguise. And for this Assertion, I

“ refer the Reader to the several Authorities recorded by the Author of the *Snake in the Grass*, and his *Defences* of it, who has proved it beyond all reasonable Contradiction : as indeed did before him the learned and pious Dr. *H. More*, as I have hinted elsewhere * in this *Vindication*.”

THESE are all the Passages that occur about the *Quakers*, either in the Body of the Bp's. *Vindication*, or in his *Preface*. And since the Words cited out of the *Preface* expressly refer to those in the Body of the *Book*, as the former were evidently wrote *after* the latter to which they refer, they ought to be consider'd as Explanatory of the former. And consequently, by the *Quakers* “ losing the *Belief* of a “ real external *Jesus* by the *Christ within* “ them,” in the Body of the *Book*, is to be understood their “ *Allegorizing away* the “ *Letter* of the New Testament, by *op-* “ *posing*, or at least *preferring*, the *Belief* “ of a Spiritual or *inward* *Christ* to that “ of a literal, Historical, and *outward* “ *Jesus*, and that in the several Circum- “ stances of him, *viz.* his Birth, Life, “ Death, &c. about the *Letter* of which “ they wrote with *Contempt*.” On Occasion of which Passages, I cannot but observe in passing, that the B. speaks of

* See Vol. II. p. 572.

those that *have been* deluded, &c. and again, of *G. Fox*, and other *Heads* of the *Quakers*, whose Enthusiastical Pretensions (borrowed at first from the Mystical Scheme of the *Familists*) *were* in many Respects the very same with those of *Mr. W.* as likewise that they *wrote* with Contempt of the *Letter* of an *Outward Jesus*: And once more, they are the *Founders* and *Heads* of that Sect that are not acquitted from *having been Deists* in an *Allegorical* Disguise. Now from these several Passages, as well as from the Reference made to *Dr. H. More*, and *Mr. Lesley*, it appears that the *B. of L.* gave this Censure of the *Founders*, or at least the *former Heads* of the *Quakers*, rather than of their present Leaders; unless as their *present* Leaders happen to incur the same Censure by maintaining the same Doctrines as the *Founders* and *former Heads* of the *Quakers* did, and accordingly make themselves Answerable for the Unchristian Tenets and pernicious Errours of their Predecessors. And as for the Body of the present *Quakers*, they are far from being charged with *Deism* by the *B. of L.* But the Reason of this Distinction shall, in Answer to the *Letter-writer*, be assigned in the Series of this Discourse.

THE Charge therefore on the *Founders* and *Leaders* of the *Quakers* is this: i. That they have lost the Belief of a real external *Jesus* by a *Christ* within them; that is,

they have either derogated from the *Truth* of the Facts relating to *Jesus Christ*, or denied the *Necessity* of the Belief of those Facts; that they have not only indulged *Allegorical* Interpretations to a great Excess, but have *allegorized* away the *Letter* of the New Testament. 2. That they did so by *opposing*, or at least *preferring*, an *inward* Christ to an *outward* one; and that not only in general, but in the several Circumstances of that *outward* one. 3. That though the Body of common *Quakers* are far from being condemned as *Deists*, yet the *Founders* and *Heads* of that Sect are not acquitted by the B. of L. from *having been Deists* in an *Allegorical* Disguise. 4. That the Principles of their Founders and Leaders were in many Respects the same with those revived by Mr. *W.* though without his usual Degree of Contempt and a professed Ridicule.

I cannot but here, by the Way, complain that the *Letter-Writer* has neglected to examine the several Passages of *More* and *Lesley* that were expressly referred to, and indeed has not so much as pretended to deny the Truth of those Citations, which in common Justice he ought to have done before he rejected them. For he only alleges, that those Authors were *Adversaries*, and therefore are not to be believed. An Answer, that supposes that an *Adversary* cannot possibly assert the Truth, and there-

therefore is not to be referred to. But this, tho' a short and easy Way of Answering any Allegation against the *Quakers*, even by my self at present, (consider'd as their *Adversary*, because I tell them the Truth,) is very precarious and unreasonable; since several Passages against them in this Discourse are on this foot not to be consider'd, that may possibly be true. And consequently, none but the Proofs of their own Party are to be admitted; and therefore no Proofs at all are ever to be offer'd against them, but on this bottom ought to be implicitly rejected. However, if they mean, that *Testimonies* against them are to be cited out of their own Books, they are so in a Copious manner in the following Discourse.

I CANNOT likewise here omit to observe in a *previous* way, that it is unaccountable that the Charge of the B. of L. on the *Quakers-Doctrines*, viz. that they are *Unchristian* and *Deistical*, should have appeared so very new and surprizing, as to have occasion'd a mighty Alarm of that Party, an immediate Application to the *Crown*, and an injurious Complaint at *Court*, without any preceding Expostulation with the Person who advanced that Charge. For, besides that such an Expostulation was, in point of Decency as well as Justice, due to a Person of his Station in the Church, (if the former could be expected from those who seem

to have incorporated ill Manners with their Religion) surely the Managers of the Affairs of that Society must have learnt that the same Charge has been formerly made, and frequently repeated, upon their Principles as laid down by their Founders and Leaders. It is scarce possible, I say, to imagine but they must have heard of that Charge upon them as made long ago, not only by Churchmen, but by Dissenters of all Denominations among us. As to the former, not only Dr. *More's* and Mr. *Lesley's* Sentiments have been already twice referred to by the B. of L. but those of the three *Norfolk-Clergymen*^a, and of Bishop *Wettenhall*^b, with several others, might be now added; as I do, with much Satisfaction, the later Performance of a present Judicious Author, Mr. *Smith*, viz. his *Preservative against Quakerism*. And as to the latter, the Dissenters, the same Charge has been made by *Faldo*^c, and *Haworth*^d, and *Burnet*, and *Jenner*, and *Cassyn*, and indeed by *Twenty-one* Dissenting Divines at once (among whom were

^a See *Brief Discovery of some of the Blasphemous, &c. Principles of the Quakers*, out of their most approved Authors; by Dr. *Beekham*, Mr. *Meriton*, Mr. *Topcliffe*, Clergymen of Norfolk, p. 12, &c. Lond. 1699.

^b See *Edward Clark and Ross's Letter to Friends*, in 1698. Published in *W. Penn's Defence of Gospel-Truths*, p. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. &c. Lond. 1698.

^c See *J. Faldo's Quakerism no Christianity*, Lond. 1672.

^d See *Haworth's Quaker converted to Christianity*, Lond. 1674.

Baxter * and *Manton* in their Prefatory Recommendation of *Faldo's* Performance upon that occasion, besides their other Productions on the same Subject. And indeed not only Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists, of whatever different Sentiments among themselves, but even several revolted *Quakers*, who were best acquainted with the Principles of their Brethren, and therefore deserted them, such as *Robert Gordon*, *George Keith*, *John Pennymann*, *Francis Bugg*, and *Henry Pickworth*, have agreed in the very same Imputation of *Deism* upon them; and more particularly the celebrated *George Keith*, in his Book, entitled, *The Deism of William Penn and his Brethren*, as well as in his several *Narratives of the Proceedings at Turner's-Hall*, the Exactness of whose Citations in the *Third* and *Fourth* of which was fully attested by *Eight* very credible Persons, Divines of Character in the Church of *England*.

I WILL only premise one farther Observation; namely, that the *Letter-writer* has grossly misrepresented the Bishop's Charge upon their Principles, when that Author pretends that the Bishop has charged the *Quakers*, in express Terms, *Let. p. 8, &c.* with having the very same Scheme with *Mr. W.* with regard to *Jesus's Miracles*. Whereas the Bishop has not asserted that

* See too *R. Baxter* in his *Quaker's Catechism*, p. 30, &c. Lond. 1655.

they

they have expressly denied the particular Facts of those *Miracles*, upon Mr. W.'s Bottom, and in his manner of a profane Ridicule; though *Consequentially* they have derogated from *them*, as well as from the other *Facts* of *Jesus*. And indeed all that he has said on that occasion, is, " That the " Enthusiastical Pretensions of their Leaders were in many respects the very same " with those that have been lately vamped " up by Mr. W."; which is farther explained by " their *Allegorizing away the* " *Letter*, and opposing, or at least preferring, an *inward* Christ to an *outward* " one, as specified in the several Circumstances of him ". And that their Principles are the same in many respects, shall be shewn by a particular Comparison of them in the ensuing Discourse.

BUT I return from these Preliminary Observations to a Proof of the Bishop's Charge on the Founders and Leaders of the *Quakers* in the several Branches of it. I say, in the several Branches of it; for it must be owned that their Old Writers vary from one another in several respects; and more particularly some of them are more professedly *Deists* than others, tho' they too make very near Approaches to Infidelity. As therefore it will be soon evinced that there is a *higher* and *lower* Degree of *Quakerism*, the Bishop's Distinction of their allegorizing away the
literal

literal Sense of Scripture, by *opposing*, or at least *preferring*, an *inward* Christ to an *outward* one, will be shewn to be just and proper. But of the *high* and *low* sorts of *Quakers*, I shall have occasion to speak farther elsewhere; and therefore I shall postpone that Consideration till proper Evidence is produced of the *unchristian* Doctrines of their Founders and Leaders, with regard to the Belief of the great Fundamentals of the Christian Religion. Now the Question in debate is evidently about a *Fact*, namely, whether the Old *Quaker-Leaders* have advanced *Unchristian* and *Deistical* Doctrines. This *Fact* then, as all other *Facts* are, must be decided by proper *Testimonies* of the Founders and Leaders of that Sect. Accordingly, the *Testimonies* relating to them shall be now produced out of their own Writings, and ranged in the following *Classes*.

First, THOSE *Testimonies* of them shall be cited that are inconsistent with the Acknowledgment of an *outward* Christ.

Secondly, THOSE *Testimonies*, that tho' they seem in *words* to allow of an *outward* Christ, yet in *effect* deny him, as they highly derogate from the *Necessity* of Faith in an *outward* Christ in order to Salvation, of whom they speak in a Comparative Manner with *Contempt*.

Thirdly, THOSE *Testimonies* that evince that their Leaders have *allegorized*
away

away the great distinguishing Facts of an outward Christ.

Fourthly, THOSE Testimonies of their Leaders that deny the Holy Scriptures to be the Christian Rule of Faith and Manners, and who vilify and treat them with contempt as compared with the *Light within*, which according to them is the supreme Rule and Judge. Agreeably to the Method proposed, I shall

First, produce some of those Testimonies that are inconsistent with the Acknowledgment of an outward Christ.

G. Fox (in his *Great Mystery*, p. 206.) says, " That if there be any other Christ but he that was crucified *within*, he is the false Christ. ---- This Christ that was risen and crucified *within*. ---- Devils and Reprobates make a Talk of him *without*. ---- *ibid.* p. 207. G. Fox disputes against this Position, That God hath a Christ distinct from all other things whatsoever; and more particularly he says, " God's Christ is not distinct from his Saints. ---- *ibid.* p. 250. G. Fox speaks thus to his Adversary G. Wade; The Devil was in thee; thou sayst thou are saved by Christ *without* thee, and so hast recorded thy self to be a Reprobate. ---- *ibid.* p. 254. G. Fox says, That they that profess a Christ *without* them, and

"another Christ *within* them, here is
"two".

W. Penn (in his *Address to Protestants*,
p. 119. Lond. 1697.) says, "What is
"Christ, but Meekness, Justice, Mercy,
" &c? [*i. e.* a Principle, and not a Per-
"son.] Can we then deny a Meek man to
"be a Christian?"-- *ibid.* p. 118. He as-
serts, "That he that believes in God, be-
"lieves in Christ". And (in *Serious*
Apol. p. 146.) *W. Penn* says expressly,
"That the outward Person which suffered
"was properly the Son of God, we utterly
"deny".

Christopher Atkinson, an eminent and
early Quaker, (in his *Sword of the Lord*
drawn, p. 5.) speaks thus, "Your ima-
"gined God beyond the Stars, and your
"carnal Christ is utterly denied.--- To
"say *this* Christ is God and Man in one
"Person is a Lye".

H. Worlidge, a Quaker-Precacher, (in his
Declaration to the Baptists, p. 13.) speaks
thus; "Christ was never seen with any
"carnal Eye, nor his Voice heard with any
"carnal Ear".

G. Whitehead (in his *Light and Life*,
&c. p. 54.) upbraids his Adversary *W.*
Burnet thus; "You are boasting of your
"God and Christ at a distance, above the
"Clouds, Stars, and Firmament". [with
much more to the same purpose.]

W. Bayley

W. Bayley, a famous Writer, (in his Works, p. 600.) says; " That the Apostles " did not preach a *visible* Christ with " *Flesh and Bones*. And he even ridicules " those who preach a *visible* Christ with " *Flesh and Bones*, at a great Distance " from all People *above*, where the Sun, " Moon, and Stars are." ---- And (*ibid.* p. 24. 25.) he speaks thus; " Who- " soever preacheth or causeth People to " believe *their Saviour is without them*, " and that the *carnal Eye* may behold his " Glory who is to be revealed,----I say, " whosoever preacheth to People of a Sa- " viour *without them*,---- and of a King- " dom *without them*,---- I charge all such, " in the Name of the most High God, to " be horrible Blasphemers, and Ministers " and Messengers of the Devil." He adds in- deed, " While the Light of Christ condemns " them *within*, and while the Kingdom of " God suffers Violence *within*." [But these softning Expressions come too late, since they cannot disguise his Denial of an *out- ward* Christ.]

Josiah Coale, an eminent Teacher, (in his Works, p. 336. in answer to *Newman*) speaks thus; " If Faith be exercised in a " *personal Being of Christ*, it is exercised " upon Fancy and Imagination; ---- for a " *Personal Being of Christ* is not Scripture." [His Works are much recommended by G. Fox, G. Whitehead, and W. Penn.]

Edward

Edward Burroughs, a famous and ancient Teacher, and consider'd as next to *G. Fox*, (in his Works, p. 101.) styles "that Christ
" to whom we pray an *Idol-God*, and a *dead*
" *God*."

John Whitehead (in his *Quaker's Refuge*, p. 40.) denies "that Christ hath now a
" *Body* of *Flesh* and *Bones* circumscrip't or
" limited in that *Heaven* that is above, and
" out of every *Man* on *Earth*.

Richard Hubberthorn (in *G. Fox's Saul's Errand*, &c. p. 8.) is cited as saying,
" That *Christ's* Coming in the *Flesh* was
but a *Figure*." And *G. Fox* himself (*ibid.*
p. 14.) says, "His *Flesh* is a *Figure*."

G. Whitehead (in his *Truth defending the Quakers*, p. 20.) says expressly, That "*Christ's*
" Coming in the *Flesh* is but a *Figure*."

W. Bayley (in his Book, entitled, *From the Spirit of Truth to all persecuting Enemies*, p. 39, &c.) speaks thus, in a *Query* put to such as own the *Scriptures*; viz.
" Whether that Place be near unto the *Spi-*
" *rit* of a *Man* where *Christ* sitteth, seeing
" the *Apostles* did exhort *People* while they
" were upon *Earth* to seek the things that
" are above, where *Christ* sitteth at the *Right*
" *Hand* of *God*? Or whether it be at such a
" Distance as above *Stars* and *Firmament*,
" wherein *Man* was never created, nor ap-
" pointed to go or seek? Or whether it be
" possible for *Man* to seek and find that
" which saveth the *Soul* at such a Distance
" from

“ from him, yea or nay ? ” [In which he answers his own *Query* about an *outward Christ*.]

William Bayley (in *William Burnet's Account* of a Conference he had with the same *W. Bayley*, and *Matt. Caffyn*, a *Baptist-Preacher*, about God and *Christ*, (in *W. Burnet's Capit. princ. &c.* p. 27, 28.) upon the said *Matthew's* declaring “ he owned no “ God nor no *Christ* to be his *Christ*, but “ that God and *Christ* that was in the Heavens above,” made Reply and said, “ What, “ is thy God and *Christ* yonder above the “ Clouds,” pointing up to Heavens with his Finger ? “ Yea, said *Matt. Caffyn*, above “ the Clouds ? ” in Contempt whereof he uttered these Words, and said, “ That *Christ* “ that was *without* was not *his Christ*, and “ that God that was *without* was not his “ God.” This, adds *William Burnet*, he “ bid us publish ; and we immediately after the Dispute committed the Words to “ Pen and Paper, with several Hands of “ Ear-witnesses.” [But in *W. Bayley's* printed Account of the Dispute this is grossly Palliated.]

H. Norton, the Quaker-Apostle of *Ireland*, much commended by *E. Burroughs* and *F. Howgil* (in the Manuscript-Copy of his *Question put to all who stumble at the Light's shining*, as cited in the *Appendix* of the *Snake's First Defence*, p. 44.) speaks thus about the *Second Coming* of *Christ* ; “ Whence must this
“ *Christ*

“ *Christ* come you wait for ? And in what
 “ Generation ? and of what Family ? and
 “ out of what Country ? And of whom
 “ must he be *born* ? That they may be no
 “ longer deceived by you, who have kept them
 “ gazing after a *false Christ*.” [i. e. an out-
 “ ward *Christ*.] The Variations of the
 “ MS. (probably the Original) from the
 “ printed Copy (an Abstract of which occurs
 “ in *W. Rogers's Great Fox dug out*, p. 45,)
 “ are too inconsiderable to be here spe-
 “ cified.

William Smith, (in his *Quaker's Primer*, p. 8.) speaks thus, “ How may I know
 “ when *Christ* is purely preached ? They
 “ that are false [Ministers] preach *Christ*
 “ without, and bid People believe in him,
 “ as he is in Heaven above ; but they that
 “ are true Ministers preach *Christ within*.”

Stephen Crisp, an eminent Preacher, (in
 his Works, p. 194.) blames *R. C.* for af-
 firming that to be the *Seed of Promise* which
 came by Generation of, and from the Pro-
 perties of Man in *Mary*,----“ And where,
 “ says he, is thy Scripture to prove that
 “ *Jesus* the Saviour was created ?”

G. Whitehead (in his *Nature of Chri-
 stianity*, p. 29.) speaks thus ; “ Dost thou
 “ look for *Christ* as the *Son of Mary* to ap-
 “ pear *outwardly* in a bodily Existence, to
 “ save thee, according to thy Words ? (p. 30.)
 “ If thou doest, thou mayst look till thy
 “ Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such

“ an Appearance of him.” And, p. 41. he
says farther ; “ And that he [*Christ*] existeth
“ *outwardly, bodily*, without us, at God’s
“ Right Hand, what Scripture-Proof hath
“ he [his Opponent] for these Words ? and
“ then what and where is God’s Right Hand ;
“ is it visible or invisible, within us, or
“ without us only ? And is *Christ* the Sa-
“ viour, as an *outward* bodily Existence or
“ *Person without us*, distinct from God,
“ and on that Consideration to be worship-
“ ped as God, yea or nay ? And where doth
“ the Scripture say he is *outwardly* and *bo-*
“ *dily* glorified at God’s Right Hand ? &c.”

Richard Hubbertborn, (in his Works,
p. 49.) saith ; “ When was *that Christ* crea-
“ ted which ye say must, as a Creature,
“ Judge the World ? And if in *Mary’s*
“ Time, who was Judge of the World till
“ then ? Or did he judge the World as God
“ till then, and as a *Creature* ever since ?----
“ And when had the *Man Christ Jesus* his
“ *Beginning* ? If you can, declare it.”

G. Whitehead (in Appendix to his *Di-*
vinity of Christ, p. 18) speaks thus ; “ If
“ the Body and Soul of the Son of God
“ were both created, doth not this render
“ him a *Fourth* Person ? for Creation was
“ in Time.”

T. Lawson, the Quaker-Adversary of
Matt. Caffyn, is cited by him, (in his *Damnable*
Heresies of the Quakers, &c. p. 36.) as say-
ing, “ That the Lord *Jesus*, whom we pro-
“ *fest*,

" *Jesus, is Accursed; professing a Spirit within him to be the only Christ*" [Which Passage G. Fox, in his Answer to M. Caffyn in *Great Mystery*, p. 142. does not pretend to deny.]

G. Whitehead, and three other Quaker-Writers, (in their *Ishmael and his Mother cast out*, p. 10. as quoted by Christ. Wade in his *Quakery slain*, p. 9.) blaspheme the Blessed Trinity, and expressly "Damn them to the Pit of Hell." [To this Book of Christ. Wade, G. Fox replied in his *Great Mystery*, p. 246. but without denying the Quotation, as neither did G. Whitehead himself in the *Defence* of his own Book against C. Wade. A Passage, which, though it has been since palliated, by making it downright Nonsense, in order to evade the Objection of Blasphemy, continued uncorrected by G. Whitehead for 44 Years together, and continues so still by his Three Associates.]

W. Penn (in his *Guide mistaken*, p. 25.) speaks of Christ as co-essential and co-eternal with his Father, &c. of his being made Man, of his dying for our Sins, rising, and ascending into Heaven, &c. as "Confused Babbler, and by Rote Canting, By-paths of vain Tradition and Invention, Romancing, dark Results of Factions, and corrupted Councils, &c."

BUT from this Inconsistency of the more ancient Quaker-Testimonies with the Acknowledgment of an outward Christ, and from their horrible Blasphemies against the

very Being of an *outward* Christ consider'd as *God-Man*, I go on to the *Second Class* of Testimonies; *viz.*

2. THOSE Testimonies of *Quakers*, that, though they seem *in Words* to allow of an *outward* Christ, *in Effect* deny him; as they highly derogate from, if not absolutely Deny, the *Necessity* of Faith in an *outward Christ* in order to Salvation; of whom they speak, in a Comparative Manner, with *Contempt*.

W. Penn (in his *Quakerism a new Nick-Name*, &c. p. 12.) speaks thus; " Since " then they [the *Quakers*] believe that Ap- " pearance, [of *Christ* in the *Flesh* at *Jeru- " salem*] they therefore need not preach what " is not to be again.----The whole Christian " World hath so long and lazily depended " on it, without their Thirsting after his " *inward* holy Appearance in the Con- " science."

The *Quakers* (in an Anonymous Book, intitled, *The Doctrine of Perfection vindicated*, p. 19. in 1663.) say, " When " you come to *this*, [Perfection] you will " cease remembering his [*Christ's*] Death at " *Jerusalem*, and will come to see how he " has been crucified in you," &c.

Edward Burroughs (in his Works, p. 306.) introduces his Opponent as saying, " They " that follow Christ aright, must follow " him *without*, to the Cross *without*, for " Justification, or Mount *Calvary without*, " they

“ they must seek for Justification *without* ;
 “ the Spirit of Christ, it leads to Christ
 “ *without* :” To this he answers ; “ See
 “ if this be not near unto *Popery*, or enquire
 “ else what he means, as if he would have
 “ People to go a *Pilgrimage*,” &c.

Ibid. p. 150, 151. *E. Burroughs* has these
Queries ; “ What is that which worketh
 “ Faith ? And where is it, within or with-
 “ out ?---Is not the Light of God *sufficient*
 “ in it self, to lead unto God all that fol-
 “ low it, yea or nay ?---Whether it is pos-
 “ sible that any can be *saved* without *Christ*
 “ manifest *within* ? If No, then whether it
 “ is not the Doctrine of Salvation, which is
 “ *only necessary*, to preach Christ *within* ?---
 “ And is he not a *Deceiver* that exhorts Peo-
 “ ple for Salvation to *any other Thing* than
 “ the *Light* of Christ, yea or nay ? And how
 “ hath *Christ* enlightened every Man in the
 “ World, if not *within* him ?” [It is here
 observable, that whereas *W. Penn*, as just
 now cited, asserts that the Faith of an *out-*
ward Christ is not *necessary*, *E. Burroughs*
 here strongly implies the *Impossibility* of be-
 ing saved without *Christ* manifest *within*,
 and indeed asserts that Doctrine to be *only*
necessary.]

Gawen Lawrie, one of *Robert Gordon's*
 Opponents, is cited by him (in his *Chri-*
stianity vindicated, or the fundamental Truths
of the Gospel concerning the Person of Christ,

and Redemption through Faith in him maintained, p. 35. Lond. 1671. 4to.) for these Words, as used in his Answer to Gordon's Testimony to the true Saviour: "What will it avail

"thee or me that we know abroad, of things
"done abroad? nothing at all; If ever thee

"or I come to know true Peace, we must
"come to know the Life that quickens; it is

"not Names nor Things done without, but the
"Life within that redeems, that purgeth, that

"sanctifies, that quickens the Soul to God."

[On which Words R. Gordon, and he himself a Quaker reformed, (who seems to bear the same Relation of an Harbinger to George Keith, as Wickliff did to Luther) reflects most truly thus; "In effect in that one

"Word thou hast made the Coming, Death,
"Sufferings, and Resurrection of the Man

"Christ, and that one Sacrifice for the taking
"away of Sin, as quite useless and unpro-

"fitable, as to our Redemption, Justification,
"or Salvation, as a Name and Thing done

"abroad that avails nothing at all," &c.]

William Smith, cited before, (in the Second Part of his *Primmer*, called the *New Catechism*, p. 55. in 1668.) speaks thus;

"Q. Where do you hold forth this Foundation [viz. the inward Principle] to be

"laid? A. It is laid of God within us, and
"is the Rock of our Safety; and so we hold

"it forth to be a sure Foundation, as knowing the Strength and Power of it; which

"defends it self that the Gates of Hell cannot
"prevail

“ prevail against it. Q. How do ye manifest it to be the *only* Foundation, and that there is not another? A. From the Unchangeableness of its own Nature and Being; for we know that God doth not lay any *visible* or changeable things for a *Foundation*, but that which is of himself *within*, and is invisible to the natural Eye, &c. Q. And is that which is *within* you the *only* Foundation upon which you stand, and the *Principle* of your Religion? A. That of God *within us* is so, for we know it is *Christ*; and being *Christ* it must needs be *only* and *principal*; for that which is *only* admits not of *another*, and that which is *principal* is greatest in Being: And thus we know *Christ in us* to be unto us, the *only* and *principal*, who was before all things, and in whom all things consist. Q. But do you hold that this Foundation, and Principle *within you*, is *sufficient to give eternal Life*? A. Yes, *we do so.*”

W. Smith (in 1. Part, p. 70.) with relation to that weighty Question, “ What do you believe concerning that great Work, which by the Death of Christ was accomplished on the Cross in Time past according to the Scripture,” passes over the Answer to it in very general Words, namely, as “ *a Dispensation of God in Times past:*” but saith nothing of any *Necessity of Faith* in him, as he died, rose, and ascended, and

is now in Heaven *without* us. But among other obscure Words, and hardly intelligible, he saith, " We *also* know and believe that " he is the same Christ *in us* which in *Dispensations past* did humble himself to the " Cross."

G. Whitehead (in *Light within*, p. 25.) speaks thus; " Herein is the *Sufficiency* of " Christ and his Light to guide opposed and " denied, *without the Scriptures*, by this our " Opposer; [*W. Burnet*] as if the Scriptures " *must needs help Christ*, the Light or Spirit," &c.

G. Whitehead (in his *Light and Life of Christ within, and its Sufficiency*, p. 38.) speaks thus; " The Quakers see *no need* of " directing Men to the Type for the Anti- " type, *viz.* neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to *Jerusalem*, either to *Jesus Christ*, or his Blood, &c."---And where " doth the Scriptures say, the Blood was " there shed for Justification; and that Men " must be directed to *Jerusalem* to it? " whereas that Blood shed is not in Being." (*ibid.* p. 40.)

G. Whitehead (in his *Antidote against the Snake*, &c. p. 27.) says thus; " We are " not offended at G. Keith's Preaching " Christ, or his Suffering or Dying *without* " us, truly considered; but at his under- " valuing the *Light within*, as not *sufficient* " to Salvation, or not *sufficient without something else*. [*i. e.* Christ *without us*."] "

G. White-

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life within*, p. 39.) says thus; "As to those Expressions, " *God-Man being born of Mary*, we do not " find them in the Scriptures, nor do we " read that *Mary was the Mother of God* " but in the *Pope's Canons, Articles, &c.*— " Indeed if the *Body* that Christ took upon " him in the Virgin, and which was after " crucified and put to Death, was God, (for " he [*i. e.* his Opponent] tells of *God-Man* " being *born* of the Virgin) then this would " make God visible, and to die when that " Body was put to Death; which were no " less than Blasphemy," &c.

G. Whitehead (in *Light, &c.* p. 42.) speaks thus—"And now does he [*W. Burnet*] not " deserve to be tried by his own Rule, [the " Scriptures] and asked, where he proves " that he is Justified by the shedding of the " Blood that was let out by the Spear, in so " many Words? And where (in so many " Words) that *Blood shed* without the Gates " of *Jerusalem* is *the Means of Salvation*;— " whereas if *that* be his *Justifier* and Sa- " viour, where is it?—It is not in being, so " then his Saviour it appears is not to be " found; whereas the Blood of Christ that " Justifieth, purgeth the Conscience, clean- " seth from all Sin, and wherein he washeth " them that follow him, is still in Being; " Cleansing and Washing being a *real Act* " and *Spiritual Work* in every true Believer " that

“ that walks in the Light, whereby the *Blood*
“ of Christ is known.”

If. Penington (in *Question to the Professors of Christianity*, p. 25. Lond. 1667.) asks, “ Can
“ *outward* Blood cleanse the Conscience?—
“ It is one thing what a Man apprehends (in
“ the way of *Notion*) from the *Letter* con-
“ cerning the things of God, and another
“ thing what a Man feels in Spirit.”

If. Penington (*ibid.* p. 34.) says; “ No
“ Knowledge of Christ can *save*, but the *liv-*
“ *ing* Knowledge. Not the Knowledge of
“ him *after the Letter*, (which the Carnal part
“ may get much of, and value itself much by)
“ but a Knowledge of him in the *Spirit*;—
“ which— runs not out into the *fleshly* Rea-
“ sonings, Imaginings, and Conceiving, about
“ the things mentioned in the *Scriptures*.”

If. Penington (*ibid.* p. 46.) says; “ Out-
“ ward Sacrifices under the Law were vain,
“ as to cleansing the Soul; and an *Outward*
“ *Belief* (of what Christ did and suffered)
“ *effects not the thing known*.”

G. Whitehead (in his *Light and Life*, &c. p. 55.) speaks thus; “ Whereas we are ac-
“ cused with *denying that Blood let out to be*
“ *any way meritorious to Salvation*, I ask
“ whether any thing is of eternal Merit and
“ Worth—that is not *everlasting*? And where
“ do the Scriptures use those Expressions,
“ and so much vary about the Blood of
“ Christ; as one while to say, that the shed-
“ ding

“ ding of that Blood *outwardly* was the
 “ *meritorious Cause* of Salvation ; another
 “ while the Word [*Shedding*] to be left out,
 “ and the Stress laid only upon that *Blood* it
 “ self, which the Soldier shed or let out of
 “ his Side with a Spear, which was after he
 “ was put to Death.”

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life*, &c.
 p. 56.) says, “ We are not to suppose *two*
 “ kinds of Saviours and Sanctifiers, that is,
 “ both a *natural*, (which is not in being, as
 “ is said of the *Blood* which was shed) and
 “ the *Spirit* which still liveth. And though
 “ *Christ*, that he might sanctify the People
 “ with his own Blood, suffered without the
 “ Gates ; I hope it will not be denied but
 “ this Work of Sanctification is wrought
 “ and fulfilled within by the *Spirit*, and that
 “ sprinkling and purging the Conscience is
 “ *inward* ; and then where the Blood is said
 “ to do it, that must needs be *Spiritual*.”

G. Whitehead (in his *Light and Life*, &c.
 p. 64.) speaks thus ; “ The shedding of that
 “ Blood, let out by the Spear, was an Act
 “ of a wicked Man, and the Spear an In-
 “ strument of Cruelty ; which to lay the
 “ *meritorious Cause*, or Stress of *Justifica-*
 “ *tion* upon, is false Doctrine ; for there is
 “ a great Difference between Christ’s offer-
 “ ing up himself by the eternal Spirit, a
 “ Lamb without Spot to God, and the Acts
 “ of wicked Men inflicted on him ; as it is
 “ said by wicked Hands they put him to
 “ Death.

“ Death.---- Again (*ibid.* p. 16.) says he,
 “ Where is *that Blood*? Is it in being, yea or
 “ nay? or did it sink into the Ground and
 “ corrupt? &c.----(*ibid.* p. 40.) How then
 “ does it Cleanse, Sanctify, Justify, Save,
 “ &c.----Whereas Sanctification being a *real*
 “ *Work* inward, that is *certainly in being*
 “ *which effects it.*”

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life*, &c.
 p. 57. in answer to W. Burnet, who had
 said, “ Tho’ that *Blood shed* be not in being,
 “ yet the *Efficacy* of *that Blood* is still in be-
 “ ing.”) thus replies; “ What *Efficacy*?
 “ Is it Natural or Spiritual? If *Natural*,
 “ then how is the Blood lost, or not in be-
 “ ing? And then, where is the *Spirit’s*
 “ *Work*? If the Virtue be *Spiritual* that
 “ saves and sanctifies, &c. it never dies or
 “ perisheth; *neither was it derived from*
 “ *that which is not in being, nor was any*
 “ *corruptible thing its Original.* If the
 “ *Bloodshed cry afresh, and sound in God’s*
 “ *Ears for Mercy for Sinners,* (as he, W. B.
 “ faith) How is God fully *satisfied*, and
 “ Man’s Debt discharged, or his Disobe-
 “ dience wrought off as before? Is Mercy
 “ still to cry afresh for, where Wrath is ap-
 “ peased and *Satisfaction* made, (as is sup-
 “ posed)? This is strange Confusion. And
 “ can *that* which is of such *infinite Worth*,
 “ as to purchase Man’s eternal *Salvation*, be
 “ *corrupted or lost*, so as not to be in be-
 “ ing? &c.”

G. White-

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life*, p. 58.)
 says, " Is not that *Christ* which purcha-
 " feth and redeems Sinners, *that precious*
 " *blood* of the Lamb which is *not corrup-*
 " *tible? &c.*" --- *ibid.* G. Whitehead cites
 these words of Solomon Eccles, an eminent
Quaker ; " The *blood* that was forced out
 " of him by the Soldiers *after* he was
 " dead, who before that bowed his head
 " to the Father, and gave up the Ghost, I
 " *did say that was no more than the blood*
 " *of another Saint*". And he *Justifies*
 him thus in saying so ; " Now to these
 " words, viz. *no more than the blood of*
 " *another Saint*: [his intent was] as to
 " *Papists* and you, whose minds are *Carnal*,
 " who oppose the Light within ; and also sim-
 " ply as to the essence of the *Blood*, which
 " you dare not say is still in being, but not as
 " to the *Spiritual* Virtue and Testimony
 " which is still in being.--- (*ibid.* p. 59.) And
 " yet I do not make S. Eccles's Expres-
 " sions therein (especially as construed by
 " our Adversaries) to be an Article of our
 " Faith ; for I own that in one Sense the
 " *Blood shed* was more than that of *another*
 " *Saint*, (tho' not in the Matter of it, as
 " to the *Visible*;) [more] in that it had a
 " peculiar Signification ; and Christ the
 " one offering was the Man peculiarly or-
 " dained or appointed of God both to
 " bear the Sins of many, to *end* the many
 " offerings under the Law ; and in all his
 " *Example*

“ *Example* and Sufferings, that were permitted to be laid on him, he both answered, fulfilled, and ended the outward Part and Administration of the Law and Shadows, and was particularly eyed and prophesied of accordingly by the Holy Prophets; and through all his Sufferings in the *Flesh*, he gave an universal Testimony, and consecrated a new and living way, even through *the Vail*, that is to say his *flesh*, that the way into *the most Holy* might be manifest.” [As to the *Vail*, see *J. Penington's Explanation* below.]

T. Ellwood (in his *Answer to G. Keith's Narrative*, p: 117. Lond. 1696.) speaks thus; --- “ That *Blood* which he [*Sol. Eccles*] said was *no more than the Blood of another Saint*, was the *Blood* that was forced out of him by the Souldier after he was Dead. The Difference---was, that in one [*Respect*] it [*the Blood*] was a voluntary Offering of Christ himself, in, and by the Eternal Spirit, before his Death; in the other [*Respect*] it was the forcible Act of a Souldier after he was Dead, and the Sacrifice compleated.” [So that *Blood* was no Part of the Sacrifice of Christ.]

G. Whitehead (in *Light*, &c. p. 65.) upon *Matt. Caffyn's Answer* to him, viz. “ That the *Blood* is in it [the Body of Christ] (or with him) in Heaven, he enter'd into the holy Place with Blood ”.

G. W.

G. W. remarks thus, "*What holy Place, and with what Blood?*"

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life*, &c. p. 60.) says; ---- "I may ask ---- whether the *Blood of God* (and of the *New Covenant*) be not *Spiritual*? If not, How is it called his *own Blood*? Acts xx. 28. And is not the *New Covenant Spiritual*? ---- If it be, surely the *Blood* of it must be *Spiritual* too".----

Ed. Burroughs (in his Works, p. 273.) speaks thus; "The Sufferings of the People of God [*Quakers*] in this Age is greater Suffering, and more unjust than in the Days of *Christ* or of the Apostles.--- What was done to *Christ*, or the Apostles, was chiefly done by a *Law*, and in great part by the due Execution of a *Law*."

James Milner (in *Quakery slain* of Christopher Wade, p. 7, 8.) is cited as saying, "That he must suffer, as *Christ* did, to save the Souls of two Women; [there mentioned] ---- and in a Juggling enchanting manner, with a Knife and a Basen he pretended his Blood was shed, and said he gave up the Ghost as *Christ* did". [A Blasphemous piece of Ridicule, which was not denied by G. Fox, (in his *Saul's Errand*, &c. p. 9.) but who justified Milner when he said, "There was a pure Seed in him, &c."]

William

William Smith, (in his *New Catechism*, p. 64.) with regard to the *Foundation* and *Principle* of the *Quakers*, speaks thus ;
 “ We believe that *Christ in us doth* offer up
 “ himself a *Living Sacrifice* unto God for
 “ us, by which the *Wrath* and *Justice* of
 “ God is appeased to us, &c”. [A Pas-
 sage, which is justified and confirmed by
G. Whitehead and *W. Penn*, as here fol-
 lows :]

G. Whitehead (in his *Light within*, p. 44.)
 observes, “ That *Christ [is] the Propitia-*
 “ *tion*, [in the Words of the Apostle] in
 “ the *present time* ; ---- and that all was
 “ not ended on the Cross ”.

W. Penn, (in his *Rejoynder to John*
Faldo, p. 284.) speaks thus ; ---- “ *Christ*
 “ *offers himself in his Children*, in the
 “ *Nature of a mediating Sacrifice* ”.

W. Penn, (in his *Serious Apology*, p. 148.)
 with regard to our *Justification* by the
Righteousness which *Christ* has fulfilled
 in his own Person for us, speaks thus :
 “ And indeed this we deny, and boldly
 “ affirm it, in the Name of the Lord, to
 “ be the Doctrine of Devils, and an Arm
 “ of the Sea of Corruption, which does
 “ now deluge the whole World ”.

W. Penn (in his *Reason against Railing*,
 p. 91.) speaks thus ; “ And *forgive us*
 “ *our Debts as we forgive our Debtors* ;
 “ where nothing can be more obvious than
 “ that which is forgiven is not paid ;
 “ and

“ and if it is our Duty to forgive *without a Satisfaction received*, and that
 “ God is to forgive us as we forgive them;
 “ *then is a Satisfaction totally excluded.*”

[On which it is well observed by G. Keith, that if a *Satisfaction* be *totally excluded*, then there is no *Satisfaction* made by Christ *within*, more than by Christ *without*.]

W. Penn (in his *Sandy Foundation shaken*, p. 14, 17, &c. Lond. 1684.) professedly labours to refute from Scripture the Doctrine of *Satisfaction* as dependent of the *Second Person* in the *Trinity*, and to shew from the Absurdities which he supposes attend that Doctrine, “ That *Christ* neither
 “ *as God*, nor *as Man*, nor *as God and*
 “ *Man*, has made Satisfaction to the Justice
 “ of his Father ;” and that in too profane a manner, and to too great a length, to be here transcribed ; to which whole Tract therefore I choose to Refer the Reader.

G. Whitehead (in his *Light of Truth triumphing over Darkness*, in Answer to Robert Gordon's *Testimony to the true Savour*, p. 16. Lond. 1670.) speaks thus;
 “ Dare any say plainly that God executed
 “ wrath and revenge from himself upon
 “ his innocent Son, or did take ven-
 “ geance upon the Son of his love ; or
 “ could that be an answering of Divine
 “ Justice, so to take vengeance on the
 “ Innocent, and let the Guilty go free

" with their Sins past, present and to
 " come; and then if all be thus wrought
 " and purchased of God by Christ, paid
 " and satisfied for in his crucified Body;
 " and that for the Sins of the whole
 " World and in their stead, and that for
 " their Sins past, present, and to come,
 " then how can God in Justice execute
 " Wrath or Revenge on any for Sin, if
 " his innocent Son hath undergone it and
 " satisfied it all, and that for all Men past,
 " present, and to come: And then what ma-
 " nifest Contradiction is it for this Man to
 " confess to his Intercession, &c? -----
 " How does this agree with the the Doc-
 " trine of such a rigid and severe *Satisf-*
 " *faction* and Payment as before implied?
 " For if the Son endured the Father's
 " Wrath to the full, and thereby stopt it,
 " (for *Priests* call it *Vindictive Justice*)
 " doth not this render God to be more
 " severe than his Son; yea, and unjust
 " also? &c. ---- *ibid.* p. 18. God ---- out
 " of his infinite Love sent his Son to
 " save Man from Sin and Death; whose
 " Sufferings, Sacrifice, Mediation, Inter-
 " cession, and Offices, (with the blessed
 " Effects thereof *within*) we own and
 " confess *according to the Scriptures of*
 " *Truth, as inwardly revealed and eviden-*
 " *ced by the Spirit, &c.*"

If.

If. Penington (in his *Question to the Professors of Christianity*, at *Query 7.* p. 20.) asks thus; "Which is Christ's Flesh and Blood which we are to partake of, whereof we are to be formed, which we are to eat and drink, and which is meat and drink indeed, nourishing to Life everlasting? Is it the Flesh and Blood of the Body which was prepared for and taken by him, wherein he tabernacled and appeared? Or is it the *Flesh* and *Blood* of him, who took, tabernacled, and appeared in the Body? For that which he took upon him was our Garment, even the *Flesh* and *Blood* of our Nature, which is of an earthly perishing Nature: but he is of an eternal Nature, and his *Flesh*, *Blood* and *Bones*, are of his Nature, &c."

If. Penington (ibid. *Qu.* 18.) asks, "Whether was it the *Flesh* and *Blood* of the *Vail*, [that cleanse the Heavenly things] or the *Flesh* and *Blood* within the *Vail*? Whether was it the *Flesh* and *Blood* of the outward earthly Nature, or the *Flesh* and *Blood* of the inward spiritual Nature? Whether was it the *Flesh* and *Blood* which Christ took of the first *Adam's* Nature, or the *Flesh* and *Blood* of the second *Adam's* Nature?" [With more to the same Purpose.]

If. Penington (p. 30. Qu. 38.) --- says ;
 “ The other [*Flesh and Blood*] was but
 “ the *Flesh and Blood of our Nature*,
 “ which he [*Christ*] honoureth in taking
 “ upon him ; in which he did the Will,
 “ in which he offered up the acceptable
 “ *Sacrifice*, but yet did not give the Ho-
 “ nour of *his own Flesh and Blood* to it :
 “ for the *Flesh and Blood of our Nature*
 “ was not *his own* naturally, but only as
 “ he pleased to take it upon him and make
 “ it *his*.”

If. Penington (*ibid.* p. 33.) speaks thus ;
 “ Now the Scriptures do expressly distin-
 “ guish between *Christ*, and the *Garment*
 “ *that he wore* ; between him that came,
 “ and the Body in which he came ; be-
 “ tween the Substance which was veiled,
 “ and the Vail which veiled it.---- This
 “ we certainly know, and can never call
 “ the *Bodily Garment Christ*, but that
 “ which appeared and dwelt in the Body.
 “ Now if ye indeed know the *Christ of*
 “ *God*, tell us plainly what that is which
 “ appeared in the Body ? Whether that was
 “ not *the Christ*, before it took up the Bo-
 “ dy, after it took up the Body, and for
 “ ever” ?

G. Fox (in his *Several Papers for the*
spreading of Truth, p. 55.) speaks thus ;
 “ *Christ according to the Flesh* was Crucified
 “ in the Days of Adam, and in *that Flesh*
 “ was the Reconciliation”.

I CANNOT but observe to the Reader, that the *Testimonies* which relate to the Sufferings and Death of the outward and inward *Christ*, the Satisfaction and Justification by his Blood, &c. have been here assigned in so very Copious a manner, because the Sacrifice of *Christ*, in his true human Nature, for the Sins of the World, and the Satisfaction made by it to the Divine Justice, are, next to *Jesus's* being the true *Messiah*, the most fundamental and important things in *Christianity*.

Thirdly, I NOW go on to those Testimonies which evince that the Leading-Quakers have *Allegorized away* the great distinguishing Facts of an *outward Christ*. And those are Testimonies that prove the Truth of that Charge either in a *general* Manner, or by an Induction of *Particulars*. Those of a *general* Nature are such as convert the distinguishing Facts that relate to an *outward Christ* into mere *Types* and *Figures* of an *inward Christ*: those of a *particular* kind are such as *Allegorize*, in an undue manner, the several great Facts of the *outward Christ*, namely, his Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and future Judgment; consider'd as compared with an *inward Christ*, and as the Preference is given by the *Quakers* to the Latter of them.

As for the Testimonies of *Quakers* that in general convert the distinguishing Facts of an *outward* Christ into mere *Types* and *Figures* of an *inward* one, there is nothing more common among them than to make the whole *History* of Christ without an *Allegory*, and the Christ within the *Mystery*; Christ without the *Figure*, and Christ within the *Substance*; tho' they cannot but be apprised that St. Paul was of another Opinion, when he informed *Timothy*,
 Tim. iii. that without controversy great is the mystery
 26. of godliness, as God was manifest in the flesh. But to proceed to particular Testimonies of this Nature.

W. Penn (in his *Rejoinder to J. Faldo*, p. 336.) complains, " That the *History* is
 " made the greatest *Mystery*, and to believe
 " the one Matter of greater Difficulty than
 " to Experience the other ;" and he speaks thus farther ; " 'Tis strange that should
 " be reputed most *mysterious*, [viz. Christ's
 " *Incarnation* there spoke of] which was
 " the *Introduction* to the *Mystery*; [that
 " is, of the *Light within*;] and those
 " *Transactions* [viz. that Christ should
 " die as a Malefactor, and that his Death
 " should reconcile God to Man] counted
 " most difficult, that were [in *W. P's.*
 " *Opinion*] ordained as so many *facile Re-*
 " *presentations of what was to be accom-*
 " *plished in Man.*" Again he says; " What
 " Carnalist in the World could have dropt
 " a more

“ a more pernicious Sentence to the Doctrine and Kingdom of Christ, than to render it more difficult to believe and lay a greater Stress upon the external than the internal Work of Christ? ---- Not this *Mystery* among the *Gentiles* is Christ in you, the Hope of Glory; but this *Mystery* among the *Gentiles* is a Man who died as a Malefactor, by his Death reconciled to God. ---- At this rate---Regeneration is a slight thing in comparison of the Knowledge of Christ *after the Flesh*. This Doctrine brings not Men to Christ *in* them, ---- but inticeth them into the vain Hope of the Hypocrite which perisheth.”

W. Penn (in his *Preface to R. Barclay's Works*) speaks thus ; “ O Reader, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness*; and if the Apostle said it in the Manifestation of the Son of God in *Flesh*, if that be a *Mystery*, ---- how much more is the Work of Regeneration a *Mystery*, that is wholly inward and spiritual in its Operations? ” --- [And how *W. P.* thought the Manifestation of the Son of God in the *Flesh* to be a *Mystery*, appears from his Testimony cited before, in which he utterly denies that *Christ* is properly *God-man*.]

W. Shewen, an eminent Quaker, (in his *Small Treatise concerning evil Thoughts*, p. 37, &c.) speaks thus ; “ Now when the true *Christian* hath travelled through

“ Multiplicity into Unity, through the
 “ various Dispensations, Operations, and
 “ Workings of the Spirit of God, before
 “ the Law, under the Law, through the
 “ Law, to the Prophets, and to the Mi-
 “ nistration of *John*; and so to *Jesus* the
 “ Son of *Abraham*, *David*, and *Mary*,
 “ and hath followed him [viz. *spiritually*]
 “ from the Manger to the Cross, and
 “ from thence to the Grave, and now a
 “ being dead and buried with him, and
 “ arising with him; and not only seeking
 “ those things that are above, but hath
 “ found them, having known and experi-
 “ enced Christ in all his Offices; *as* the
 “ great Ordinance of God, *as* a Mediator,
 “ Reconciler, maker of Peace, [which
 “ things, says he in the *Margin*, are not
 “ only to be *read*, professed, and talked
 “ of, but experimentally known] healer of
 “ the Wound, and maker up of the Breach
 “ of the first *Adam*; made *as* a quickning
 “ Spirit, and Lord from Heaven; *as* a
 “ King, Priest, and Prophet; *as* a Saviour,
 “ Sanctifier, and Redeemer; *as* a Purifier,
 “ and Maker an end of Sin, and Bringer
 “ in of everlasting Righteousness; and *as*
 “ a High-Priest to present to God, with-
 “ out spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.
 “ When he is thus known to perform all
 “ these Offices, *in* and for his People, he
 “ is *then* by *such* known to sit down at the
 “ Right Hand of God, having accomplished
 “ the

“ the Work the Father gave him to do,
 “ having put all things under, and restored
 “ all things into their primitive Order;
 “ he then is also known to surrender up the
 “ Kingdom to the Father, and God to be-
 “ come all in all. Here the first is known
 “ to be last, and the last first, &c. --- [And
 “ as a farther Explanation, he adds in the
 “ Margin] This is the *Ascending* of Christ
 “ up, where he was before he descended,
 “ &c. --- He that can understand, let him.”

[Throughout all this long Quotation *W.*
Shewen Allegorizes the *History* of Christ, as
 not being the *Mystery*, but an Introduction
 to and Type of it; viz. till Christ has (*Spi-*
ritually) surrender'd up the Kingdom to God
 that is within, or till the true Christian (as he
 calls him) has arrived at *Perfection*.]

W. Bayley (in his *Visitation from on High*,
 in Collection of his Works, p. 291.) speaks
 thus; “ So now this Christ was before the
 “ World (that now is) began, and was a
 “ Seed before any Name was given to it,
 “ which, in Process of Time, (being begot-
 “ ten of God) was born of a Virgin, had
 “ a Body prepared to do the Will of his
 “ Father; (as it is at this Day) but none
 “ knows him, (or ever shall) Born but of a
 “ Virgin, (he that hath ears to hear, let him
 “ hear) whose Eye is single, Mind stay'd
 “ on God, forsakes all, takes up the daily
 “ Cross, denies himself, follows the Lamb
 “ whithersoever he goeth, loves him that
 “ had

“ had been slain, more than all, more than
 “ Father, Mother, Wife, Husband, Chil-
 “ dren, House, or Lands, yea, or his own
 “ Life; these *only* know him *Born*, tho’
 “ once like *Mary* said, *How can this be,*
 “ *seeing I know not a Man?* (Seeing I have
 “ no Strength, Wisdom, Parts, or Abilities
 “ of my own) but the Answer is, as it was,
 “ (*be thou but the Virgin,*) *The Power of*
 “ *the most High shall overshadow thee, and*
 “ *the holy Thing which shall be born of thee*
 “ *shall be called the Son of God.* This was
 “ Christ’s Name in the Womb, a holy
 “ Thing, (*read within,*) and then had other
 “ Names, as *Jesus* and *Emanuel*.—But the
 “ *Virgin* is subject to the Power of the most
 “ High, where *Christ* is known to be first,
 “ *a holy Thing*, then *a Child given*, and *a*
 “ *Son born*, which is *Emanuel, God with us*,
 “ a Saviour, from the *holy Thing* to a *Child*
 “ *given* and a *Son born*; a wonderful Coun-
 “ sellor, the *Mighty God*, the *Prince of*
 “ *Peace*.---- But that which may be known
 “ of God, (or *Christ which is one*) is mani-
 “ fest in People, *there* he is, and is only to
 “ be found, and he that hath seen him, (who
 “ is the Son) hath seen the Father also.”
 In this Passage *W. S.* evidently prefers
 Christ’s being the mighty God *within* to
 his being so *without*; that is, tho’ the *Man*
Christ is not so, yet the *Seed within* the true
Quaker is so, as it grows up in him; and the
 one is only Preparatory to the other.]

G. Fox

G. Fox (in his *Several Papers given forth for the spreading of Truth*, viz. in that concerning *Christ's Flesh that was offered*, p. 54.) speaks thus;--- "Christ the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World; then *Adam* and *Eve's* clean *Flesh* was defiled:---- then *Christ* according to the *Flesh* was crucified, the Lamb slain, that *Flesh* of his which is the *Mystery*.---- So the *Belief* comes after this Righteousness, Christ the *Seed*.--- So in this lies the *Belief*; (p. 57.) so through his *Flesh* he doth reconcile, and by the offering up his Body, that his *Flesh*, that which hath been slain since the Foundation of the World, and yet never corrupted;---- which *Flesh* is the *Offering*--- and the *Blood* of this *Flesh* cleanseth from Sin, (p. 58.)--- All outward Offerings and Sacrifices were given to Man after he fell, and the Lamb slain, which Offering is a Figure of Christ, the *Seed* to be brought forth and offered up. (p. 59.)---- So through this Offering is the *Reconciliation*, through the Offering of his *Flesh* that never corrupted, but takes away Corruptions, and his Blood cleanseth from Corruptions: "The Life read," &c. [*i. e.* in a spiritual and mystical Sense: whence it appears that G. Fox makes the *Flesh* of Christ in Adam's Time the *Mystery*, and the Offering then the *Reconciliation*; whereas he, in the Testimony cited above, styles Christ's Coming in the *Flesh*, or his outward *Flesh*, a Figure.]

So

Gen. iii.
15.

So much in *general*, as to the *outward Christ* being an *Allegory*, and the *inward Christ* the *Mystery*. I now proceed to some more particular Instances of the Leading Quakers having *allegorized away* an *outward Christ*. And I choose to begin with the great original *Prophecy* of the *Messiah*, viz. that *the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's Head*, as *allegorically* evacuated and lost by a *Spiritual* commentary.

W. Penn (in his *Christian Quaker*, p. 97, 98.) speaks thus; "The *Serpent* is a *Spirit*: "Now nothing can *bruise the Head* of the "Serpent, but something that is *Spiritual*, "as the *Serpent* is: But if that *Body of Christ* were the *Seed*, then could be not "bruise the *Serpent's Head* in all, because "the *Body of Christ* is not so much as in "any one; and consequently the *Seed of the Promise* is an holy Principle of *Light* "and *Life*, that being received into the "Heart bruise the *Serpent's Head*: And "because the *Seed*, which cannot be that "Body, is *Christ*, as testify the Scriptures, "the *Seed* is one, and that *Seed* is *Christ*. "Gal. iii. 16."

Gen. xii.
3.

W. Penn (*ibid.* p. 97.) says likewise concerning the *Seed* that God promised to *Abraham*, "This *Seed* must be *inward* and "Spiritual, since one *outward* thing cannot "be the proper *Figure* or Representation of "another, nor is it the way of Holy Scriptures so to teach us," &c. [So that the promised

promised Seed is not a Person, but a Principle, and the *Light within* is the *promised Seed*; and therefore the *Man Jesus Christ* was not the *Seed promised to Adam to bruise the Serpent's Head*, nor the *Seed promised to Abraham, in which all Nations should be blessed.*]

* *If. Penington* (in his *Queries concerning Christ*, p. 22.) speaks thus; "Is not *Christ* the *Seed*? and is not *this Seed* sown in the Heart? Now if *this Seed* spring and grow up in me into a *Spiritual Shape or Form*, (though it be but of a *Babe*) is not *Christ* then formed in me?---- And is not this the same *Christ* that took upon him the Body of *Flesh*, and offered it without the Gates of *Jerusalem*?"

James Naylor (in his *Love to the Lost*, p. 55. *London*. 1656.) speaks thus; "And as thou followest the *Light out of the World*, thou wilt come to see the *Seed*, which by the *World's Wisdom and Glory* is crucified; to which *Seed* are all the *Promises*, and wherein is all the *Knowledge of God* and *Christ*; and as that *Seed* is raised, therein is the *Father* revealed, &c.---- So that you shall see him to whom all *Power and Judgment* is committed in *Heaven and Earth*,----who dwelleth in the *Body of his Saints*;---- he alone reveals himself in *Spirit* to such as wait in the *Light*," &c.

* See too *W. Shewen's Allegory on Isaiah's Prophecy of the Messiah*, c. 9. v. 6. in p. 42. above.

Stephen Crisp has been cited above, as blaming R. C. for affirming that to be "the Seed of Promise which came from Generation of, and from the Properties of Man in Mary;" and therefore a farther Account of his *Allegorizing* away that important Prophecy shall be here omitted.

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life*, &c. p. 52.) speaks thus; "Must not the Serpent's Head be bruised within, and the Seed be known within which bruisseth it? And hath not he that is born of God the [or this] Seed in him? And is not this Seed Spiritual?"

ANOTHER Instance of the Quakers Allegorically perverting the Prophecies about the outward Christ is cited in W. Hayworth's *Quaker converted to Christianity*, viz. in p. 7, 8. of Preface; "He brought his Son out of Egypt"; that is, say they, "out of the Egyptian Darkness of our Hearts:" As likewise that the distinguishing Character of the only begotten Son is interpreted thus, "Begotten in us."

W. Penn (in his Works, 2d Vol. p. 813.) speaks thus; "The Scriptures tell us of the Birth, Life, Ministry, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus of Nazareth: ---- but they cannot savingly reveal Christ to a Soul, neither can they give us the Soul and Substance of those things that are therein declared. They are an exact Map or Picture of things, but not the things them-

Hof. xi. 1.
Mat. ii. 15.

“ *themselves.* It is the Office of the Divine
 “ *Light and Spirit of Christ* to shew Men
 “ *these Secrets; and to none are they, or can*
 “ *they be, known,* but to those that walk ac-
 “ *cording to the Convictions of it.*”

W. Penn (in his *Serious Apol.* in Vol. 2.
 of Works, p. 71.) advises thus, in order to
 be *truly Orthodox*; “ *Mind that Measure of*
 “ *Light and Grace which God hath placed*
 “ *in the inmost Parts, and obey the same, &c.*
 “ *---Then wilt thou know what Christ's Life,*
 “ *Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Me-*
 “ *diation mean, &c.*” [that is, as understood
 in the *Spiritual Sense*, which he considers
 here as the *true Meaning*.]

W. Bayley, cited before, (in his *Visita-*
tion from on High, in Works, p. 291.) speaks
 farther thus, *viz.* about the *Birth of Christ*;
 ---“ *Awake therefore now ye Shepherds, who*
 “ *have been keeping your Flocks by Night,*
 “ *and look upwards, ye Earthly-minded,*
 “ *and behold his Star in the East; the Wise-*
 “ *men (whose Eyes are in their Head) have*
 “ *seen it, and been led by it, till the Babe*
 “ *was found lying in a Manger, for in the Inn*
 “ *there was no room for him; he that hath an*
 “ *ear to hear, let him hear.---* Behold a
 “ *Wonder! a Woman doth compass a Man,*
 “ *and yet she is clothed with the Sun.* Was
 “ *there ever such a thing heard of? but this*
 “ *is in Heaven.* And none knows it or ever
 “ *shall---* but the *Virgin.*---- That which
 “ *may be known of---* *Christ* --- is manifest

“ *in*

" in People; there he is, and is only to be found," &c. as above cited. [From which last Passage it appears, that the Circumstances of the *Birth of Christ* are not only Allegorized to Excess, but are *Allegorized away*.]

Rev. xii. 1. If Penington (in his *Question to the Professors of Christianity*, p. 15.) speaks thus; " He [Christ] was not only born (in the *Flesh*) of the Virgin Mary, but he was also born in the Spirit of the Woman clothed with the Sun, which had the Moon under her Feet, and on her Head a Crown of Twelve Stars, &c."

G. Fox, R. Hubberthorn, and G. Whitehead, have been already cited, as asserting that "*Jesus's Coming in the Flesh is a Figure*;" and therefore their *Allegorical Testimonies* on that Occasion are now only Referr'd to.

G. Whitehead (in his *Truth defending the Quakers*, p. 42.) asks his Opponent; " Dost thou believe that it [the glorious Appearance of a Light from Heaven upon the Head of Jesus at his Baptism] was *Visible to the carnal Eye*, as a created Dove is? &c." ---[Thus this miraculous Fact, that was a visible *Attestation* of Jesus's Authority from Heaven, is evacuated in a *mystical* manner; as may all the other Facts of the Man Jesus, as to their respective Attestations, on the same *Allegorical Bottom*]

W. Penn

W. Penn has been already cited, as saying that "The Transactions [of the Life of the "outward Christ] were as so many facile "Representations of what is to be accomplished "in Man:" [that is, as to the Birth of Christ, that the first Birth of the Saviour is accomplished in the second. See Book with that Title, *Antw.* 1686.] And again, that the Gospels "are only a Map or Picture of "things, but not the Things themselves." And therefore these Passages, under this Head, are only Referred to as a Key to his Sentiments about all the Facts of the Life of Christ.

W. Penn, (in his *Serious Apology*, &c. p. 38, 39. Vol. 2. of his Works, *Lond.* 1726.) speaks thus concerning *Jesus's Miracles*;
 "But how weak an Argument the Doctrine
 "of Miracles is, to prove the Verity of the
 "Christian Faith, or Doctrine of Revela-
 "tion, at this time of Day, is best seen by
 "considering it was Weakness that occasioned
 "them: For had not the Lord *Jesus* ob-
 "served the Darkness and Carnality of those
 "Times, to be so great, as without reach-
 "ing through the black Clouds of their
 "Traditions and Superstitions, by the Hand
 "of his Miracles (or visible Signs to their
 "Understandings, or rather Senses) there
 "was no Likelihood of fastning a Convic-
 "tion on them, there never had been need
 "of an external Miracle in any such Sense.
 "I would that the Man [his Opponent,
 D T. Jenner]

“ T. Jenner] should know, we have received
 “ and maintained our Faith in Christ by more
 “ noble and sublime Arguments, than that of
 “ Miracles; namely, the Truth, Reason,
 “ Equity, Holiness, and Recompence of the
 “ Christian Religion; which Miracles can
 “ never render more, or less, *intrinsically*
 “ so.----Not that we put a low Esteem upon
 “ Miracles, but comparatively only: And to
 “ say they are Ceased, is in no other Sense
 “ true, than that wherein *Vision* or *Revela-*
 “ *tion* is; I mean, they are ceased to them
 “ that have not Faith. For many have,
 “ and do know the Power of taking up their
 “ Sick-Beds, and Walking; their Faith in
 “ God’s Power has made them Whole.” [That
 is, Miracles are understood by W. P. in the
 same Sense as *Vision* or *Revelation* are, and as
 no more ceased than they are; and therefore
 whatever Esteem he may pretend to have for
 the Miracles of Jesus, tho’ they are here
 Depreciated too by being only suited to his
 Dark Times, and as not being Arguments of
 great and perpetual Use for the Conviction
 of Unbelievers, it is evident he speaks here
 of *Figurative* and *Mystical Miracles*, name-
 ly, such as those of *Vision* and *Revelation*:
 for I have not yet heard of any uncontroverted
external Miracles of W. Penn and his Friends,
 or that *literally sick* Persons among them
 have taken up their Beds, and walked. In-
 deed W. P. does here use the Word *exter-*
nal Miracle, but how consistently with him-
 self,

self I need not say, since he expressly asserts,
 " That *Miracles* are an Argument that but
 " *weakly proves the Verity of the Christian*
 " *Faith at this time of Day ;*" and according-
 ly pretends that he and his Friends " have
 " *received and maintained their Faith in*
 " *Christ by more noble and sublime Argu-*
 " *ments than that of Miracles, viz. the*
 " *Reasonableness, &c. of the Christian Re-*
 " *ligion, which, says he, Miracles can ne-*
 " *ver render more or less intrinsically so.*"
 But neither the B. of L. nor any other
 Defender of *Jesus's* Miracles has ever pre-
 tended that *Miracles* are an *internal* Argu-
 ment, tho' they have justly asserted that
 the *Miracles* of *Jesus* are very strong and
 cogent *external* Arguments of the Truth of
 his Religion, in *Concurrence* with those
internal ones that establish it ; for they have
 been far from derogating from the *Rea-*
sonableness of it, how absurdly soever *W. Penn*
 may have here confounded the *external*
 and *internal* proofs of Christianity, in the
 Nature of which there is a great Dis-
 parity, tho' nothing of *Weakness* in either
 of them. And indeed he shews but a *low*
Esteem of *Miracles*, which are a very *Ra-*
tional Proof in their own Nature, when he
 lays the chief Stress of the *Christian* Cause
 upon *Moral* Arguments, and principally re-
 solves his Faith into them, *as* he has *received*
 and *maintained it*, that is, *as* it is evidenced
 by the *Light within*. For in the same

Page, (*viz.* 38.) he uses these Words ; ---
 “ Throughout the whole Exercise of our
 “ Religious Life, We ascribe our Know-
 “ ledge and Instruction to *no other thing*
 “ than the Discoveries or *Revelation of the*
 “ *Spirit of God in our Hearts ;* --- Profes-
 “ sing our *Revelation* to be [a] solid and ne-
 “ cessary Discovery from the Lord, &c.”
 Which are Words so very plain and signifi-
 cant, as compared with what has been just
 now cited from *W. Penn*, that I cannot
 think it improper to observe on this Oc-
 casion, that tho’ the B. of *L.* has no where
 charged the *Quakers* with directly Denying
 the *Miraculous Facts* of Christ, yet it is
 now evinced that they have so done *in*
effect, and *consequentially*, as Some of them
 have *Allegorized away* the very Being of
 an *outward* Christ, and his distinguishing
Facts ; and as Others, who have allowed
 of those *Facts*, have denied the *Necessity*
 of the *Belief* of them to Salvation, and
 have resolved the *Truth* of Christianity into
 the *inward* Operations of Christ, as *more*
Miraculous than the *outward* ones ; and
 indeed as *W. Penn*, in particular, has here
 thrown *Contempt* on the *outward* Miracles
 of *Jesus*, when he consider’d them as a
weak Argument for the *Truth* of his Re-
 ligion. So great Reason is there, from the
Testimonies above, for the B. of *L.* to have
 asserted, that the *Leaders* of the *Quakers*
 have *Allegorized away* the distinguishing
 Facts

Facts of Christ, either by *opposing*, or at least *preferring*, an *inward* Christ to an *outward* one, in the several *Circumstances* relating to him.]

As to the *Sufferings* and *Death* of *Christ*, and the *Sacrifice* and *Satisfaction* made by him; in order to avoid a tedious Repetition of the *Testimonies* of *G. Fox*, *W. Penn*, *R. Hubberthorn*, *E. Burroughs*, *G. Whitehead*, and Others, that have been already Cited, not only as highly derogating from them, but as *Allegorizing* them away, I shall Refer the Reader to those *Testimonies* that have been Anticipated in the preceding *Classes*. To which I shall here only add the *Allegorical* Perversion that is given to *St. Paul's* Quotation of the O. T. about the *Crucifixion* of *Christ*, namely, *Gal. iii. 13.* *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a Tree*; that is, say the *Quakers*, "on the *Tree of Knowledge*." --- (as cited in *Lesley's* 1. *Def.* part 1. p. 32, 33.)

As to the important Article of the *Resurrection* of *Christ*; it ought not only to be here Recapitulated, that *G. Fox* has asserted *Christ's Flesh* to be *Figurative*, and that he was *Crucified* in the Days of *Adam*; as likewise that *W. Penn* has declared, "That the several *Transactions* of *Christ* (and among them his *Resurrection*) " were " but *facile Representations* of what would be " *accomplished in Man*;" and consequently, that all his Performances, and among them

that of his *Resurrection*, are *moralized*, and *figuratively* transacted in the Minds of Men, as the *principal* Completion of them; but it is certain that *Eight* Leading *Quakers* in Behalf of their *Body*, as well as their more Private Writers, have *Allegorized* away the *Resurrection* of an *outward* Christ. For* they have denied the *Identity* of his *Rising Body* with that which Died upon the Cross; the Change of which they assert to have been so *substantial*, (and not merely in some *Qualities* of that Body) as to have, by just and necessary Consequence, overthrown the Proofs drawn from the *Senses* of the Apostles, and particularly those of *Thomas*, as conversant about that Body which was experimentally demonstrated to be the very *same*; and thereby to have subverted the Grounds of our Belief of his *Resurrection*. And besides this Assertion of a *Substantial* Change in the *Rising* Body of Christ, which renders it not the *same* with that which Died, as maintained in the foresaid Confession of Faith of their Society, I shall here add a few Testimonies of their *Leaders*, which either derogate from the Credibility of Christ's *Resurrection*, or resolve the Belief of it into the internal Testimony of the *Spirit*: viz.

* See the *Christian Doctrine* or Confess. of Faith, of the *Quakers*, in Sewel's Hist. p. 621, 624.

E. Bur-

E. Burroughs (in his *Works*, p. 42.) says,
 "We witness the same *Christ* made ma-
 nifest in us, and *his Resurrection*, not be-
 cause *Paul said so*, [1 Cor. xv.] but we
 have *seen it*, and are *Witnesses* of it."

W. Penn (in his *Primitive Christianity*,
 p. 97, 103.) speaks thus; "Christ's Mini-
 ster's true *Witnesses*, they speak what they
 know, not by Report." [i. e. the Report of
 the Apostles, and their History of Christ's
Resurrection.] — "The Credit of a Witness
 is that he has *heard, seen, or handled*.—
 I say, if Christ's Ministers are his *Wit-
 nesses*, they must *Know* what they speak;
 that is, they must have *experienced* and
past through those *States and Conditions*
 they preach of; ----- Or, they are *Thieves*
 and *Robbers*." [From a Comparison of
 which Passages of these Two Leading Qua-
 kers it appears, not only that they do not
 believe the *Resurrection* of *Christ* as Credi-
 bly *attested*, and as founded on the *Report*
 of *Paul* and the other Apostles; but like-
 wise that the *Resurrection* of *Christ*, which
 they assert they *know* and have *experienced*
 in *passing* through several *States and Condi-
 tions*, is entirely *Allegorical*, and can mean
 nothing else but the *Moral Resurrection* of
Christ in their Hearts. And as for those
 Ministers who preach the *Resurrection* of
Christ, which they have not *seen* or per-
 sonally *known* themselves, that is, upon the
 credible *Report* of the Apostles, who *heard*,

saw, and handled the word of Life after his Resurrection, they declare them to be all Thieves and Robbers. To which may be briefly added the Testimony of their Apostle G. Fox, when he speaks thus, (in Great Mystery, p. 242.) "Of whose (that is, of Christ's) Resurrection we are Eye-witnesses:" Since it is evident this cannot relate to the outward or literal, but to the inward or mystical Resurrection of Christ.]

W. Penn (in his Invalidity of J. Faldo's Vindication, p. 369, 370, &c.) explains and confirms the true Sense of what has been now cited about Christ's Resurrection; namely, when he interprets 1 Cor. xv. 35, 44, &c. which is a Description of the Resurrection of our Bodies, only of the Spiritual State of the Soul in this Life. Says he, "I do utterly deny that this Text is concerned in the Resurrection of man's Carnal Body at all."--- And again; "I say this does not concern the Resurrection of Carnal Bodies, but the two States of Men under the first and second Adam; Men are sown into the World Natural, so they are the Sons of the first Adam; but they are raised Spiritually, through him who is the Resurrection and the Life, and so they are the Sons of the second Adam,--- who came to raise up the Sons of the first Adam from their dead to his living, their natural to his spiritual State, &c."

[What

[What I cite this Passage for is not only to shew that *W. P.* has here *Allegorized away* one of the Principal Proofs of the *literal* Resurrection of our Bodies, by perverting it into a *Moral* State of the Soul in *this* Life, and therefore has asserted, in other words, that the *Resurrection is already past*; (which the B. of *L.* had imputed to the *Quakers*, in *Second Vol.* p. 573.) but likewise to evince, upon the Authority of *St. Paul*, that *W. Penn* has, in a *Consequential* manner, subverted the Faith of *Christ's literal Resurrection*, as far as it depends on the Account of it by *St. Paul* in this famous Chapter. For the Apostle establishes a strict Connexion between the *Resurrection* of our *Bodies* and the *Resurrection* of the *Body of Christ*. Says he, ver. 16. *If the Dead rise not, then is not Christ raised.* So that if the Resurrection of our dead Bodies is here spoke of by the Apostle in an *Allegorical* Sense, as *W. Penn* asserts, the Resurrection of the *Body of Christ* must unavoidably be understood in the same *Allegorical* Sense, and not as *literally* performed according to the *Report* of *St. Paul* and the other Apostles: And if so, another Connexion of *St. Paul* is established in the following Verse; viz. *If Christ be not raised, your Faith is vain*: The meaning of which is too plain to be illustrated.]

ver. 17.

THOUGH

THOUGH I might entirely Refer to several preceding Testimonies of G. Fox and other Leading Quakers, to shew how they Allegorically elude the *Ascension of Christ into Heaven*, and his *Sitting on the right Hand of God*, in which I have indeed Anticipated my self; yet I will add a few more Testimonies to what has been collected on that occasion.

G. Whitehead, (in *Light within*, p. 25.) in Answer to W. Burnet, who had said, "That the Being of Christ is at the right Hand of God in the Heavens," speaks thus; "What does this---tend to but to exclude both the Being of Christ out of his People, and to confine both God, Christ, God's Right Hand of Power, and Being, all remote from his People? And then how is their *Conversation in Heaven*? How are they in the Father's Right Hand? and what Heaven is it? And where are the Heavenly Places the Saints were in, which Christ and the Son of Man was in when upon Earth? Was it a natural Heaven, or a Spiritual? And is not that the Heaven of Heavens, or the chief Heaven, which is most near to God, most Spiritual?"

G. Whitehead (ibid. p. 40.) says; "This God, Christ, and the Spirit, the Quakers did not find above the Clouds, where the Baptist [W. Burnet] imagines at such a distance, for they never ascended, to
" seek

“ seek their Residence *above the Clouds*,---
 “ where the *Baptist* tells us of finding God
 “ and *Christ*, though they were never there
 “ themselves to find him; and it seems
 “ they are like to be without both, while
 “ they are telling of finding God and
 “ *Christ above the Clouds* where they cannot
 “ come. --- Now, I ask if they [who are
 “ said by the Apostle to be *alive, and to re-*
 “ *main unto the coming of the Lord,*
 “ *1 Thess. iv. 15.*] did live and remain to
 “ a *personal Coming* of Christ in the Clouds,
 “ yea or nay? Or can it be reasonably
 “ thought to be a *Coming* that is not yet,
 “ that they lived and remained unto? And
 “ further *John* in *Rev. i.* says, *Behold he*
 “ *cometh with Clouds*; he also, when he
 “ was in the *Spirit*, saw him that was the
 “ *First and the Last*. Now, did *John* see
 “ him with *Carnal Eyes*? Or was this
 “ *Coming* such as you expect *outwardly*?
 “ Moreover, *Christ* said, *the Son of Man*
 “ *shall come in the Glory of his Father, &c.*
 “ (*Matt. xvi. 27.*)---Now what is that
 “ *Glory of the Father* in which his *Coming*
 “ is? Is it *Visible* to the carnal Eye? And
 “ when was *that Coming* to be? Is it now
 “ to be look'd for *outwardly*? But farther,
 “ we do acknowledge the several *Comings*
 “ of *Christ* according to the Scriptures,
 “ both that in the *Flesh*, and that in the
 “ *Spirit*, which is *manifest* in several de-
 “ grees,

“ grees, as there is a growing from Glory
 “ to Glory : but *three Comings* of Christ
 “ (not only that in the *Flesh* at *Jerusa-*
 “ *lem*, and that in the *Spirit*, but also
 “ *another coming in the Flesh*, yet to be ex-
 “ *pected*) we do not read of ; but a *second*
 “ *Coming without Sin unto Salvation*,
 “ which in the *Apostles Days* was look’d
 “ for.”

G. Whitehead, (*ibid.* p. 63.) to the Ques-
 tions put by his Opponents, viz. “ Is the
 “ *same Body of Christ* that suffered on the
 “ *Cross in Heaven*, yea or nay ? ” Answers
 thus ; “ The *Body of Christ* in Heaven
 “ is not *Carnal*, but *Spiritual*.” Again,
 “ But what became of *that Body* that suf-
 “ fered, is it in Heaven, yea or nay ? ”
 Answ. “ I do not read that he is in
 “ *Heaven with a Body of Flesh, Blood, and*
 “ *Bones ; it was Changed.*”

G. Fox is cited by Matt. Caffyn (in his
Damnable Hereses, &c. p. 29.) as affirm-
 ing in plain words, *before many witnesses*,
 “ That he knew Christ come *within him*,
 “ and he looked for him to come *no other-*
 “ *wise.*” [To which G. Fox (in *Great*
Mystery, p. 141.) replies, “ That Christ
 “ was come in him ; ” but takes not the
 least notice of the other Passage, that “ he
 “ looked for Christ to come *no otherwise ;* ”
 on which the chief Stress was laid.]

R. Hub-

R. Hubbertborn (in his Works, p. 56.) speaks thus ; “ How many Souls hast thou “ [viz. his Opponent] led into that Pit “ of Darkneſs, as to believe that Chriſt is “ yet to come in Perſon ? Now the Scrip- “ ture which thou bringeſt, *Matt. xxiv.* “ 27. proves no ſuch thing as another “ Chriſt coming in Perſon.” [Whereas his Opponent ſaid nothing of another Chriſt coming in Perſon, but ſpoke of the Return of the very ſame Chriſt which R. H. here denies, tho’ in a Sophiſtical manner.]

H. Norton, whoſe Teſtimony was cited before about the *Second Coming of Chriſt*, (in his Answer to *J. Draper’s Queries*, p. 81.) ſays further thus ; “ Whereas thou “ aſkeſt me what I believe concerning the “ *Second Coming of Chriſt*, or whether “ there is any other Coming of Chriſt be- “ ſides what is in his Saints ? I believe “ that there was *five hundred Brethren* at “ once that ſaw his *Second Coming* ; and “ that there is a *Thouſand* now that ſees “ *the ſame* ; and that there is *no other* “ *Coming* than what is revealed in his “ Saints.” ----- *Ibid.* “ Thou aſkeſt me, “ What do I underſtand by the eternal “ *Judgment*, or whether there ſhall be a “ Time when God ſhall Judge all Men, “ &c ? ” Answer, “ The eternal Judge is “ upon his Throne, and the Time of his “ *Judgment*

"Judgement is come, and the Hearts of all
"Men are made manifest before him."

G. Whitehead (in *Light within*, p. 41.)
says; "That the Dead in Christ shall rise
"first we own to be an effect of Christ's
"Coming, and know that there is a Dy-
"ing in Christ, a being Baptized into
"his Death, before a Coming forth or
"Rising in the Likeness of his Resurrec-
"tion:---- But now to know these States,
"what it is to die with Christ, to be
"conformable unto his Death, and to
"partake of the Power of his Resurrec-
"tion; these things are hid from that
"Eye and Expectation which is carnal, and
"only known to them that are come to the
"Mystery of Faith in a pure Conscience,
"and to know that Power by which the
"Faith of the Operation of God is known,
"and the Work and Effects of it."----*ibid.*
p. 69. G. Whitehead says, "If that Body
"of Flesh, Blood, and Bones, be the Seed
"to which God giveth a Body as it pleaseth
"him, and which shall be raised;-----
"then from hence every Man must come
"forth with two Bodies, which is mon-
"strous.----- Now you might reckon him
"a very ignorant Man---that should reckon
"the Bodies of the Sun, Moon and Stars,
"and the Bodies of Birds, Beasts and
"Fishes, (1 Cor. xv.) to be all one in
"Matter and Substance, &c." [Hence it
appears,

appears, that as the *Quakers* pretend that the *Change* of the Rising Body is in *Substance* and not merely in *Qualities*, they cannot believe any Real *Resurrection* of the Body that Died; since if the *Substance* is *changed*, it is a *new* Body in all respects.]

W. Shewen, whose Book, p. 37, &c. was cited above for a *mystical* Explication of the *Life* and *Sacrifice* of Christ *within*, and of his *Figurative Ascension into Heaven*, and *sitting down at the Right Hand of God*, may justly here be cited again, as speaking thus; "He [*Christ within*] then [*i. e.* in the State of *Perfection* of a Quaker's true Christian,] is "known to *surrender up the Kingdom to the Father, and God to become all in all.*" [Now since Christ's *surrendring up the Kingdom to God the Father* follows in order after the *Resurrection* of the Dead, *W. Shewen*, by asserting that Christ has already *surrendred up the Kingdom to the Father*, necessarily supposes that the *Resurrection is past already*, and consequently overthrows the *Christian Faith* in the same manner as *St. Paul* says *Hymeneus and Philetus* did.]

1 Cor. xv.
23, &c.

2 Tim.
ii. 18.

AND as some of the *Quakers* have *Allegorized away* an *Outward Resurrection*, so have they *consequentially Heaven and Hell*. However, I shall add a few Testimonies to shew.

shew that some of their chief Leaders have *in effect* denied any other *Heaven* and *Hell* than those *within them*.

G. Fox (in his *Great Mystery*, p. 214.) speaks thus; "There's none have a Glory " and a *Heaven* but *within them*, which was " before Man had a Being."

H. Norton (in his Answers to J. Draper's Queries, p. 81.) speaks thus; --- "Thou " asketh me whether the Saints shall partake of *any other* Glory or Perfection than " that they now enjoy. *Ans.* I say the " Saints can partake of no *no other* Glory " or Perfection than what they *now* enjoy.--- "Thou asketh me if there be *any other* " *Heaven* than what's *in* the Saints? and " where *that Heaven* is that *Christ ascended* " up into? *Ans.* I know and believe that there " is *no other* Heavens than that the Saints are " in, wherein dwells Peace, Righteousness, " and Joy. And that the *Kingdom of Heaven* is where that *Christ* himself preached " it, *Luke xvii. 21. viz. The Kingdom of* " *God is within you.*"

G. Whitehead's Testimony, as cited above, shall be here only Referr'd to, namely, when he derogated so much from that *outward Heaven* into which *Christ ascended*, as to ask, " *What Heaven is it?---Natural or* " *Spiritual?*"

G. Fox (in his *Great Mystery*, p. 101.) speaks thus; "To witness *Heaven* and " *Hell*

" *Hell within*, and the *Resurrection*, [i. e. "*within*"] is not the *Mystery of Iniquity*, " as their *Adversaries* affirmed, it being " what the *Scriptures* bear Witness to."

[But as some of the Leading *Quakers* have *Allegorized away* the *Resurrection* of the same *Body*, and any other *Heaven* than that *within* them, they must *Consequently* be presumed to *Allegorize away* an *Outward Hell* also, without any farther *Testimonies*.]

I SHALL only add farther, in Proof that the *Quakers* have *Allegorized away* the distinguishing *Facts* of *Jesus Christ*, what is notorious and confessed by their whole Society, namely, that by a *Spiritual* and *Mystical* Construction they have superseded the Necessity and Use of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*; tho' they are founded on the Positive Institution of *Christ* himself, as recorded in Holy Scripture, and shewn to be there of *perpetual* Use and Obligation till *Christ* himself shall come: A Passage, which they have boldly pretended ought to be understood of *Christ's Coming within them*, not only in Contradiction to the obvious Sense of those Words as used in Scripture, but as understood, and reduced to Practice, by all other *Christians* from the Time of *Christ* himself. But tho' it may be unnecessary to multiply Quotations about what is Acknowledged by the *Quakers* themselves, namely, that they have dropt and evacu-

ated those Ordinances; yet to shew how far, and with how *unchristian* a Spirit they have *Allegorized away* the *Facts* relating to *Jesus Christ*, I will lay one or two of their *Testimonies* on this Occasion before the Reader.

G. Fox (in his *News out of the North*, p. 14.) Declares it to be "as unlawful to return
" to *Baptism* as to *Circumcision*; and calls
" the *Lord's Supper* the *Table of Devils*,
" and *Cup of Devils*, which is in the Gene-
" ration of *Serpents*, &c."

James Naylor (in his *Love to the Lost*, published in his *Flourishing Times*, in *Seet. concerning the Lord's Supper*, p. 44.) speaks thus; "What I have received of the Lord
" [in *St. Paul's* own Words, tho' in a quite
" contrary Sense] that I shall *Declare* unto
" you:--- If you intend to *sup* with the
" Lord, or *shew the Lord's Death* till he
" come, Let your Eating and Drinking, so
" oft as you do it, be in *Remembrance of*
" him; and in his Fear, that a *Death* you
" may witness to the Lusts and Excess;
" which is that which *slew him* since the
" Foundation of the World, &c.--- But
" if you eat [*i. e.* at *Common Meals*, the
" very *Abuse* corrected by *St. Paul*] in *Re-*
" *membrance of him*, and so come to Die
" to that which *slew him*, then do you
" *shew the Lord's Death* till he come."

AFTER so profane a Commentary, I omit any other Testimonies, and Refer the intelligent Reader to the professed Arguments of the Leading *Quakers* against *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, as they are examined and *confuted* by that very Able Person *George Keith*, in which he clearly evinces from *Scripture*, that they are *Positive Institutions* of Christ, and of *perpetual Obligation* under the *Gospel*. Lond. 1698.

IT appears then from the *Testimonies* collected under this *Third Class*, that the Leading *Quakers* have asserted the *Necessity* of believing a *Christ within*, tho' not of one *without*, as the proper Object of the Faith of *Christians*; and have set up *another Mediator*, and not the Man *Christ Jesus*, and supposed him to perform a *Sacrifice within*, *another Sacrifice* than he did at *Jerusalem*; an imaginary *Sacrifice*, that is as much an *unbloody* one as that of the *Moss*, and as *often* repeated, and as *unscriptural*, and therefore as *Absurd* and *Unjustifiable*; instead of the one *Sufficient* and *perfect Sacrifice* of Christ on the Cross for the Sins of the World. So that they have *in effect* given us *another Gospel*, as they have *Allegorized away* and *Mystically lost* the *Birth*, *Life*, *Sufferings*, *Death*, *Ascension*, and *Resurrection* of the Man *Christ Jesus*, and have converted them into correspondent *Operations* of the *Light within*, on which they *principally* depend for *Salvation*. They

have therefore sufficiently Justified the B. of L. in his Assertion, That they have *Allegorized away* those great distinguishing *Facts* of a *literal Christ*, by *Opposing*, or at least *Preferring*, the Belief of an *inward* to that of an *outward Christ*. However, if any Reader desires farther Satisfaction about the *Quakers Allegorizing away*, and thereby really Evacuating, the *Life, Sufferings, Death*, and other Distinguishing *Facts* of the *outward Christ*, I refer him to *W. Penn's Christian Quaker* (c. 17. p. 150, 151, &c.) which after so numerous a Train of *Testimonies* I think it superfluous to transcribe.

I NOW proceed to the *Fourth Class* of *Testimonies* of the Leading *Quakers*, namely, of those who deny the Holy *Scriptures* to be the *Rule* of *Christian Faith* and *Manners*, and who Vilify and treat them with *Contempt*, as compared with the *Light within*; which, according to them, is the *Supreme Rule* and *Judge*.

W. Penn (in his *General Rule of Faith and Practice*, p. 211. *Lond.* 1699.) speaks thus; "No Book, Writing, or Engraving
" on visible and perishable Matter, *can be*
" *the Rule now*.----- The Rule must be *in-*
" *ward and Spiritual*, which *no mere Book*
" *can be*."

W. P. (*Ibid.* p. 212) says; "The *Scriptures* are *not perfect*; and if imperfect,
" how can they be the *Rule of Faith*, since
" the Rule of Faith must be perfect?"

Ibid. p. 213. "They [the *Scriptures*]
 "were *Occasional* Writings,--- and not such
 "a *Rule* which ought to be plain, proper,
 "and intelligible."

Ibid. p. 214. "The *Scriptures* no where
 "say of themselves, that they are the *Rule*
 "of Faith and Life."

Ibid. p. 215. "How shall I be assured
 "that *these Scriptures* came from God?---
 "If they are to be tried by the *Spirit*,
 "[as *W. P.* endeavours here to prove they
 "must be] then it is most congruous to
 "call the *Spirit* by way of Excellency,
 "and not the *Scriptures*, the *Rule*." [Here
W. P. argues from the Loss of the *Original*
Scriptures, and the *Various Readings* of
Copies, and the Differences of *Translations*,
 that the *Scriptures* are not the *Rule*, in the
 very same manner as the *Deists* usually
 do, whose Fallacious Reasonings he here
 transcribes; and he falsely asserts (with
 Mr. *Hobbes*, &c.) that they were not *Authen-*
tick, till they were declared so in the
 Council of *Laodicea*, i. e. 360 Years after
Christ.]

Ibid. p. 217. *W. P.* says; "The *Scrip-*
 "tures were not rightly discerned and col-
 "lected by *Tradition*."---And again, "The
 "Canon is uncertain, as is likewise the Dif-
 "ference of *Canonical* and *Apocryphal Scrip-*
 "ture." [All which are well known to be
 the Common, tho' weak, Topicks of *Infid-*
els against the *Scriptures*.]

Ibid. p. 221. "Does the Declaration [*i. e.*
" of the *Spirit* in Scripture] jarr, or make
" weak that from whence it came? Or be-
" cause of God's *Condescension for a Time to*
" *external Mediums* [*i. e.* the *Scriptures*,
" here spoke of] shall *they* turn the *Light*
" and *Spirit* out of the Office of *Rule* and
" *Judge*?"

Ibid. p. 222. "Christ left nothing in
" *Writing* for the *Rule* of Faith and Practice
" that we hear of. And doubtless, had he
" intended the *Rule* of his *Followers* to
" have been a *written Rule*, he would have
" left it upon Record with all *Punctuality*,
" *This* must be believed, and *That* done on
" Pain of eternal Death. Nor did his *Fol-*
" *lowers* write in the *Method* of a *Rule*, as
" the *Law* was written; nor did they *so*
" call or recommend what they writ."

Ibid. p. 225. "The *Scriptures* are un-
" certain upon their [*i. e.* the *Protestant*]
" Foundation, but not upon Ours: Doth
" our Manifesting their Faith concerning
" the *Scriptures*, to be grounded upon their
" own Imaginations or *Human Traditions*,
" make void the *Scriptures*, or render them
" uncertain? By no Means, for we would
" have them received upon the *Spirit's Testi-*
" *mony and Evidence*, which gave them
" forth."

Ibid. p. 226. "That one Age of Chri-
" stianity should have one *Rule*, and ano-
" ther Age another *Rule*; That [the *Apo-*
" *stolical*

"*stolical Age*] the *Spirit*, and this but the
 " *Letter*, is more than any Man can
 " prove."

Ibid. p. 231. "I read the *History* of such
 " things; [the *Doctrines* of *Christ*] This
 " saves not; neither can the *History* be the
 " *Rule* leading into the *Mystery*. That be-
 " longs only to the *Spirit*, that searcheth
 " out the deep things of God. Consequent-
 " ly the *Spirit*, and not the *Scripture*,
 " is the *Rule* for so believing and living."

Ibid. p. 232. *Object*. "But if God had
 " not revealed those things that are in *Scripture*,
 " by it to us, how could they have
 " been known by us? *Answer*. They were
 " known by the *Light* and *Spirit* of *Christ*
 " before they were written, &c."

Ibid. p. 235. "Were the *History* of the
 " *Transactions* of *Christ* and his Followers
 " wanting,---- and that the Lord saw it
 " needful to acquaint Mankind therewith,
 " no doubt but the *Light* and *Spirit*-----
 " would have supplied that want, &c."-----
 Again, "It does not follow, because every
 " Man has a Measure of *Light* to inform
 " and rule him, that therefore he must
 " needs know all which that *Light* knows,
 " or is able to reveal to him." [But how
 inconsistent this is with the Reason of the
 pretended *Infallibility* of the *Quakers*, name-
 ly, because they have an *infallible Spirit*,
 which knows all things, is very evident.]

Ibid. p. 237. *W. P.* attempts to prove at large, "That the *Light* and *Spirit* within the *Heathens* was sufficient to discover these things, (*viz.* the *Fall of Adam*, "*Christ's Birth, Sufferings, &c.*") from the *Sibylline Prophecies, &c.*" [See abundantly more upon this Topick in his *Christian Quaker*, c. 12.]

W. Penn (in the Conclusion of his *Judge of Controversies*, p. 243, 245, 249, &c. where he uses none but the *Popish* Arguments of the *Necessity* of an *Infallible Judge*, as applied to the *Spirit*) plainly denies the *Scripture* to be the *Judge* of Controversy. ---- Says he, "The *Judge* of the Mind or meaning of *Scripture* is both an only and an *infallible Judge*. ---- *Immanuel* admits not of any *Book*, or *Literal Rule* or *Judge*, to come between that *In-dwelling Spirit* of *Light, Life* and *Wisdom* from *God*, and the *Soul*, as its *Rule* of *Faith* and *Practice*."

R. Barclay (in his *Apology*, p. 25. 43.) professedly asserts, That "the *Bible* is not an *adequate Rule* of *Faith* and *Manners*;" and (*ibid.* p. 38.) That "the *Scriptures* are a *secondary Rule*, and *subordinate to the Spirit*, from whom they have their *Excellency* and *Certainty*. And (*ibid.* p. 68.) he denies the *Scriptures* to be *Necessary*."

S. Fisher

S. Fisher (in his Works, p. 112.) denies "the *Scriptures* to be necessary to Salvation." [Tho' the *Christ* within them is supposed necessary.]

G. Whitehead and *E. Burroughs* (in their *Son of Perdition*, p. 61. in Answer to *J. Wright*, who had affirmed that the *Scriptures* are an *Infallible Teacher* of the Doctrine of Salvation) speak thus; "This is a false Assertion: For first the *Scriptures* --- are subject to *change* and *alteration*; and that which is so is not *infallible*; for that only is *infallible*, which admits of no Change or Alteration; but such are not the *Scriptures*, (the *Writings*) and therefore not *infallible*; tho' it is acknowledged, the Truth and Way of Salvation declared in the *Scriptures* are *infallible*. [i. e. the *Light* and *Spirit* within only is *infallible*."] Again, p. 61. They say, "for the *Spirit* is *infallible* which gave forth the *Scriptures*, but the *Scripture* is changeable in *Translation* and *Interpretation*, as we see by Experience, and therefore not *infallible*." [Which cannot possibly be meant of mere *Ink and Paper*.]

BUT as a farther Demonstration of *W. Penn's* true Sentiments of this Matter, he (in his Works, Vol. 2. p. 800. Lond. 1726.) confesses, that "They [the *Quakers*] do not Read the *Scriptures* in their Meetings; tho' they read *their own Epistles* there."

"there." [A Practice, which he there de-
fends very weakly.]

W. Penn (in Works, Vol. 2. p. 813,
and 814.) proposes this Objection, viz.
"That nothing can be the *Rule* of the
"*Christian* Religion, but what discovers
"to us that there is one *Jesus of Naza-*
"*reth*, and that he is *Christ the Lord* :
"But never was any one Man instructed
"by that *Light* that is in the Conscience
"of every Man, that there ever was such
"a one as *Jesus of Nazareth*, much less
"that he was the *Lord*, and least of all
"what he required of his Servants; there-
"fore *no Light within*, common to all
"Mankind, can be the *Rule* of the *Chris-*
"*tian* Religion, since it was never possible
"for any Man to learn the least part of
"the *Christian* Religion by the *Light* that
"is in every Man's Conscience." To this
W. Penn Answers, by "Agreeing that no-
"thing can be the *Rule* of that Religion,
"but what discovers to us that there is
"one *Jesus of Nazareth*, and that he is
"*Christ the Lord* ; but, says he, I distin-
"guish then between an *Historical* and *Spi-*
"*ritual* Discovery of *Jesus of Nazareth* ;
"and so of the *Rule* by which He and
"his Servants are to be known. The
"Scriptures tell us of the *Birth*, *Life*,
"Ministry, *Death*, *Resurrection*, and *As-*
"*cension* of *Jesus of Nazareth*, and in brief
"of the Ministry and Sufferings of his
"Blessed

"Blessed Followers and *Apostles* ; and if
 "must be acknowledged to be a great Mer-
 "cy and Privilege to us that we have
 "them ; but they cannot *Savingly* reveal
 "Christ to a Soul, neither can they give
 "us the Soul and Substance of those Things
 "that are therein declared. They are [as
 "has been cited above] an exact Map, or
 "Picture of Things, but not the Things
 "themselves. It is the Office of the Di-
 "vine Light and Spirit of Christ to shew
 "Men these Secrets ; and to none are they,
 "or can they be known, but to those that
 "walk according to the Convictions of it.---
 "So that those who read the Scriptures
 "of Truth, by which they have an *Histo-*
 "rical Knowledge of the Coming of Christ,
 "and so are a Rule to that Knowledge, as
 "also to the Doctrines therein expressly
 "declared, they must come to the Light
 "of the Eternal Word to understand them,
 "and to see the Glory of the Only-begot-
 "ten of the Father, as those of Old beheld
 "it ; else the Scripture is a Sealed Book.---
 "Wherefore the Light or Spirit of Christ
 "is the first Great Rule, even the Rule of
 "understanding the Scriptures, which we
 "own to be the secondary Rule. And We
 "say that a Measure thereof is given to
 "all to profit with." --- He adds, " If
 "the Light, or Spirit within, common to
 "all Men, does not ordinarily reveal the
 "History of Jesus to all Men, yet who
 "dares

“dares say it *cannot* do so?” [But the Question is not, what the Spirit of God *can* do, but what it *does* or *does not* do. For if the *Light within* were *Universal*, it *would* certainly *do* so.] “Is it not more reasonable to suppose there may be *no absolute necessity* of it, since the greater part of the World would then have been left without the Means of Salvation? Yet the *Substance* of what *Christ* commanded is *revealed* to all Men by the *Light within*; — viz. Matters of *Morality* and Duty, common and *essential* Truths.” [And accordingly the *Moralists* and Collectors of *Duty* in a state of *Nature*, are here cited by him for those *essential* Truths.] — And when it is farther *Objected*, “If all Men have *Light*, Why do not all Men know *Jesus*?” He *Answers*, “All don’t *obey* it, tho’ they have it. This is not the *Light’s Insufficiency*, but Men’s *Disobedience*.” [To such manifest Absurdities, and such a Confusion of *Heathens* with *Christians*, is *W. Penn* reduced by his Principles of the *Universality* and *Sufficiency* of the *Light within*, consider’d together. And for more *Evasions* of this Nature, See *W. Penn’s Christian Quaker*.]

G. Fox has wrote a Book, of which the very Title is “*The Heathen’s Divinity set upon the Heads of all called Christians, who say they had not known that there*”
“*bad*”

"*had been a Christ, unless the Scripture
had declared it to them. London, 1672.*"

T. Elwood (in his Answer to G. Keith, p. 86.) speaks thus; "He [G. Keith] must grant the Object of *their Faith* [i. e. of the *Heathens*] to be, not the outward Appearance of *Christ in the Flesh*; but his inward Appearance and Manifestation, in and by his Divine *Light, Life, Word, and Power in their Hearts.*" [So that the *Quakers* are obliged to suppose such Persons *Heathens* and *Christians* at once.]

G. Fox (in his *Great Mystery*, p. 168.) speaks thus; "Them that never heard the *Scriptures outwardly*; the *Light* that every Man hath that cometh into the World being turned unto, with *that* they will see *Christ*, with *that* they will know *Scripture*, with *that* they will be led out of all Delusion; and that is more than *Conscience.*"

Hum. Smith (in his *True and Everlasting Rule*, p. 29.) asserts, that "There is *no other Rule, Means, or Name*, by which a Man shall ever come to walk with God, but that which is manifest of God in him, even the *Light* of the Son of God in him."

G. Fox (in his *News out of the North*, p. 39.) denies "The Books of *Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John* to be the *Gospel*, and he calls them *Carnal.*"

ONE of the principal *Quakers* at a Meeting of their Ministers in 1678, (as is Attested by the Author of the *Snake*, &c. p. 193, 337.) being urged with 1 Cor. i. 2. as a Proof for the *Invocation of Christ*, had the Assurance to reply, "That *Paul was blind and ignorant*, and that they saw beyond him." As likewise some of them have stiled "The *Prophets and Apostles low and carnal in their Day.*"

G. Fox (in *Brief Discovery*, &c. p. 7. &c.) speaks thus; "The *Scriptures are Death, Dust, and beastly Ware*; --- and those that preach out of them are *Conjurers, Devils, &c.*" And (in his *Several Papers*, &c. in 1671.) He stiles them, "Dust and *Serpent's Meat*, ----- which feeds you *Serpents, Dogs, and Swine.*" [These profane Expressions are weakly palliated, as only spoke of mere *Ink and Paper.*]

S. Fisher (in his *Apolog. Pref. to Rusticus ad Acad.* p. 32.) says; "The *Scriptures are a Rotten Foundation.*"

E. Burroughs (in his *Works*, p. 47. 105. and 485.) says; "The *Scriptures are a Bewitching Letter, &c.*" And again, "The *Scriptures are not a standing Rule*, neither do they teach to worship and serve God."

G. Fox and R. Hubberthorn (in *Truth's Defence*, p. 102.) say; "The *Scriptures are but a Killing Letter*; and *cursed* is the *Serpent* which beguiles, and thou art
" he

" he : Look not for him without thee, for
" *he is in the Scriptures.*"

W. Deansbery (in his *Discovery*, p. 17.)
speaks thus ; " The *Dead Letter*, which
" Man in his carnal Wisdom called the
" *Gospel*, had deceived me."

G. Whitehead (in *Light and Life within*,
p. 33.) speaks thus ; " Without the gui-
" dance of the *Spirit*, the right use and
" end of the *Scriptures* cannot be known ;
" they are as a *Book sealed*, only by the
" *Spirit* truly opened, &c."

W. Penn (in his *Rejoynder to J. Faldo*,
p. 38. in 1673.) speaks thus ; " We can
" never by *Authorities* prove the *Scriptures*
" to be given forth by *Inspiration.*"

G. Whitehead (in *Serious Apol.* p. 49.)
asserts, that " What is spoke by the *Spirit*
" of Truth in any [i. e. *Quakers*] is of as
" great *Authority* as the *Scriptures*, and
" greater."

G. Fox (in *Great Mystery*, p. 213.) says,
that " They [the *Quakers*] have the same
" Degree of the *Spirit* the *Prophets* and
" *Apostles* had."

W. Penn (in *W. Haworth's Quaker con-
verted*, &c. Pref. p. 3.) says, " That *George*
" *Fox* was as good a *Prophet* as *Isaiah.*"

G. Fox (in *Great Mystery*, p. 246.) says,
" The *Scriptures* are not the *Word of God* :
" And (*ibid.* p. 302.) the *Scriptures* are
" not the *Ground of Faith.*"

G. White-

G. Whitehead (in *Light within*, p. 25.) speaks thus; "Herein is the Sufficiency of Christ and his Life to guide opposed and denied *without the Scriptures* by this our Opposer, [W. B.] as if--- the Guidance of the Spirit now were not to be esteemed of as *Scripture, inspired as well as the Scriptures were, when given by Inspiration to the Men of God of Old, &c.*"

W. Bayley (in his Works, p. 295.) speaks thus; "The *Scriptures* cannot properly be called the *Word of God* in any Sense."

G. Bishop (in *Mene Tekel*, p. 22.) asks, "How Dare any say that the *Scriptures* are the *Word of God* without the highest Blasphemy?" [Indeed all the Quaker-Writers agree in denying that Title to the *Scriptures*, under a weak and ridiculous Pretence that the said Title is not given to the *Scriptures* in the Bible, and belongs to none but Christ himself; whereas they usually style their own wild Effusions, *The Word of the Lord.*]

G. Fox (in his *Several Papers*, p. 62.) speaks thus; "To you all This is the *Word of God.*"

G. Fox (even in a *Title-Page*,) speaks thus; "The *Words* of the Everlasting and true *Light*, which is the *Eternal* and true *God.*"

W. Bayley (in Works, p. 293.) "This is the *Word of the Lord God* to all People upon Earth."

H. Smith, (in *Title-Page*) "The true and
"everlasting Rule from God discovered."

G. F. (in his *Doctrinal Works*, p. 29.)
"Hear the Lord, &c." [But so great a
Variety of these Blasphemous Pretensions
occurs in their respective Writings, that I
shall here add no more of them.]

AFTER these several Setts of *Testimonies* that have been extracted out of the Writings of the *Founders* and *Leaders* of the *Quakers*, (to which Multitudes of other Instances might have been added) in order to support the Charge of *Deism* on the said *Founders* and *Leaders*; all which I now submit to the Judgment of the Publick, to Determine, whether They that have maintained the several Doctrines that are now Collected can with any Propriety of Speech be stiled *Christians*; that I may the more securely Guard this Collection of *Quaker-Testimonies* from the imputation of False, or Partial, or Imperfect *Quotation*, I cannot think it improper to declare that these *Testimonies* have been extracted with all Sincerity, and that I am not conscious of any unfair Artifices having been used on that occasion. And to be more Particular, I have with my own Eyes Examined a very Considerable Part of these *Testimonies* in the *Original Books* of the *Quakers*, and do Attest the Faithfulness of those Citations I my self have Reviewed. And as for several other *Testimonies* that are Collected in

the *Third* and *Fourth Narratives* of *George Keith*, both I and the Reader have just Reason to depend upon the Fairness and Accuracy of the *Citations* of *Quaker-Writers* that are made in them, when we recollect that they have received a *Solemn Attestation*, by those eminent *Divines*, who have Publickly Declared before each of those *Narratives*, that "They having carefully Examined the *Quotations* of them, do Testify the *Faithfulness* of them, and that they *exactly* Agree with the *Books* out of which they are taken." And they add in the *Attestation* prefixed to the *Third Narrative*, that "They had also since Compared a Printed Copy of the Papers *G. Keith* then Read, and found the same Agreement there, excepting only some little Mistakes of the Printer, most of which they Corrected, and caused to be put amongst the *Errata*." And they further Declare, that "They are very sorry to find such *manifest Proofs*, that those *Quakers*, whose Words *G. Keith* hath recited, have taught such *Doctrines* as he hath Charged them with." And they Conclude (as, they say, they thought themselves obliged) with "Warning Others--- to beware of all such *Teachers*, as take not the *Holy Scriptures* for the *Rule* of their Faith and *Doctrine*." These *Attestations* were made in 1698 and 1700.

And since I omitted the *Names* of the *Attesters* before, I will here subjoin them * as being Persons of great Integrity, Candour, and Learning. And indeed I cannot but take Notice, by way of farther Confirmation, that those *Citations* in the *Third* and *Fourth attested Narratives* of *G. Keith*, which I my self have examined in their *Original* Books, (and they are not a few) I have found exactly agreeable to them. I say, in *G. Keith's Third* and *Fourth attested Narratives* : For, I chose rather to draw some of the *Testimonies* that are selected above, out of those two *attested Narratives*, as being more *Authoritative*, than out of *G. Keith's* other *Three Narratives* which are not so *attested*.

SOME other *Testimonies* above, I confess, are taken out of the late Mr. *Lesley's Snake in the Grass*, and his two *Defences* of it ; to which the B. of L. had *Referred* the Reader of his *Vindication of Jesus's Miracles*. And notwithstanding the *Reflections* cast on the *Bishop* for doing so, both by the *Letter-Writer*, and by the Author of the *Cloud of Witnesses*, (which shall be here considered) I am of Opinion, that the B. did

See *Let.*
P. 9. 11.
and *Cloud*
&c. p. 6.

* Under their respective *Attestations*, their Names stand thus; *Thomas Whincop*, D. D. *William Bedford*, D. D. *Lilly Busler*, M. A. *Samuel Bradford*, M. A. [late Bishop of Rochester,] *Z. Isham*, D. D. *R. Altham*, B. D. *William Whitfield*, Rector of *St. Martin's Ludgate*; *J. Adams*, Rector of *St. Alban, Woodstreet*.

very justly *Refer* the Reader to those Books of Mr. *Lesley* in an *occasional* manner ; since as he mentioned the *Quaker-Leaders* incidentally, and in a *cursor*y way, he did not pretend in a few short *Paragraphs* to *Prove* his *Affertions* against them, as the Authors of the *Letter* and *Cloud* &c. most unreasonably expect he should have done. For any thing more than a bare *Reference* would have been an highly improper *Digression*, and entirely foreign to the immediate Subject of the B.'s *Vindication of Jesus's Miracles* ; with which a professed *Argument* against the *Quakers* had been absolutely inconsistent. And no less weak is the other

Ibid. Objection of the Author of *The Cloud* &c. against the B. on occasion of his *Reference* to Mr. *Lesley*, as if his Authority were *insufficient*. But is not this an Objection too trifling to be seriously Answer'd, namely, that because Mr. *L.* was against the *Revolution*, therefore he is of no *Authority* on any other occasion ; or, because he engaged in wrong *Politicks*, that therefore he is of no *Authority* in the Controversy he engaged in with the *Quakers* ? This is as palpable an *Ill Consequence*, as that because he wrote well against the *Deists*, he cannot be supposed to have wrote well against the *Quakers* ; in the study of whose Writings he spent a great many Years, and indeed (as far as I can learn) was at more Trouble and

See p. 6.
in Marg.

and Pains in that Controversy, than any Divine of the *Church of England* had been before: For it must be owned that the *Quakers* made a successful Progress in the World by being *Despicable*, and grew Numerous by too great a Neglect and *Contempt* of their *Writings*, as supposed to be an Enthusiastical sort of Gibberish, unintelligible in themselves, or affectedly obscure, tho' indeed full of the deepest *Subtilty*; and therefore possibly fewer Divines of the *Church of England* had been conversant in their *mystical Writings*, than Others among us. But how much soever Mr. L. was mistaken in his *Political* Notions, he must be confess'd, by all that have perused his *Writings* without Prejudice, to have given the World a *Faithful* Account of *Quakerism*; tho' it is owned his Work would have been more *Perfect*, if he had not too much indulged the Pleasantries of his *Wit*, and had sometimes wrote in a more *serious* manner: But indeed it was somewhat difficult for an Author of his lively Parts wholly to forbear Lashing so much Ignorance, Enthusiasm, and Infidelity as he was conversant about. However, as Mr. L. has asserted that "The *Quakers* have not been able to catch him at one false Quotation," i. e. in his *Snake* See *Def.*
&c. And whoever peruse with Attention 2. Part 1.
and Impartiality *G. Whitehead's Antidote* p. 95.
&c. and *Jos. Wyeth's Switch* &c. which

See Lett.
P. 9.

were professedly wrote in *Answer to the Snake &c.* will be of the same Opinion, when they find little besides poor *Evasions*, and wretched *Subterfuges* in both those Performances. And indeed it ought here to be Recollected, that not only the Author of the former of them, but of the latter likewise, to whom the *Letter-Writer* particularly refers, as having *Answered Mr. L. beyond all reasonable Contradiction*, were abundantly Triumphed over by Mr. L. in the two *Defences* of his *Snake, &c.* in a full and clear *Reply* to them; as is Demonstrated not only by the Evidence offer'd in those *Defences*, but by the perpetual *Silence* of both those Adversaries afterwards, and the utter incapacity they found themselves under for ever to revive the Dispute, and attempt another *Reply* to those *Defences*. For it was not the *Authority* of Mr. L. who labour'd under *personal* Prejudices, (as the Collector of *The Cloud of Witnesses* weakly calls it) but the *Authorities* cited by him, and the superiour Force of Truth that imposed *Silence* on both those Writers; a thing not usually, and without Necessity, practised by the *Quakers* in case of an Attack on any Member of their Body. So that upon the whole, the *Accuracy* of Mr. L.'s *Quotations* in his *Snake &c.* and *Defences* of it, stands justly Vindicated, or rather confessed by the Conduct of his *Adversaries*; and therefore his Books on this Subject

Subject were properly *Referr'd* to by the B. of L. in his *Vindication*, and some few of his own *Authorities* are likewise cited in this *Discourse*.

HAVING thus gone through the *Four Classes* of *Testimonies* of particular Leading *Quakers*, (which are a vast Over-balance to the Weight of the particular *Testimonies* cited by the *Letter-Writer*, and a Larger and Brighter *Cloud of Witnesses* than that produced on the other side of the Question, and which fully prove the Principles of the *Leading Quakers* that are above cited to be *Deistical*, and Destructive of the Fundamentals of *Christianity*,) I shall consider what the *Letter-Writer* says with regard to See *Litt.*
any *Publick Confession of Faith* of the *Qua-* P. 10.
kers; namely, when he pretends that "The
" equitable way of determining the Doc-
" trines of any Society is, that they should
" be judged by their own Writings, which
" they have delivered as a Formal Confes-
" sion of Faith:" And again, "that Pri- Ibid. p. 24.
" vate Persons, who write as such, are
" accountable for their own Opinions, and
" Societies for what they deliver as their
" *System of Faith*." Agreeably to which,
I would immediately proceed to the Consi-
deration of the *Quaker's* more *Publick* Con-
fession of Faith, as said to be given by a
competent Number of them; but that it is
not improper to *Premise*, that the Distinc-
tion here assigned of *Private* and *Publick*
F 4 Confessions

See Lett.
P. 3. 13.

Confessions of Faith holds more strongly of all other Communions in the World than of the *Quakers*; to whom, upon their acknowledged Principle of *Infallibility*, it cannot properly be applied. For tho' Other *Private Writers* may be excused (as our Author endeavours to Apologize for some of his Enthusiastical and Ignorant Brethren) upon the imputation of Errours, as they are confessedly *fallible* Men; yet particular *Quaker-Writers*, as they pretend to be acted by an *infallible* Spirit, and therefore (according to their usual *Consequence*) to be *infallible* themselves, to be led into all Truth as the *Apostles* were, and to speak and write immediately from the *Eternal* God, must be consider'd as equally *infallible* in their *private* and *publick* Confessions of Faith. So that however Other *Erroneous* Writers are, I say, excusable by their confessed *Fallibility*, yet particular *Quakers* are fairly to be cited as *Authoritative* Writers, since they pretend to be *inspired* by the *Light within*, or the *Spirit* of God. This Difficulty, which is thrown in the way of particular Testimonies of *private Quakers*, is likewise in some measure removed by the Cloud of particular *Witnesses* cited both by the *Quaker-Author* of that Pamphlet, and by the *Letter-Writer* against the B. of L. For to what Purpose were particular Testimonies, and particular Confessions of Faith,
cited

cited by both those Writers, if neither of ^{See Lett.}
 them is of any Authority? I proceed how- ^{p. 18, 19,}
 ever to make some Observations on that ^{20.}
 single *Publick* Confession of Faith which ^{See Cloud,}
 the *Letter-Writer* has cited out of *Sewel's* ^{&c. p. 7---}
History, p. 649: (it should have been ^{30.}
 p. 626. if he means the *London-Edition* ^{p. 22.}
 in 1725.) I say, that *single* Confession of
 Faith; for tho' he has cited two other of
 their *Confessions*, yet they are evidently the ^{p. 11. 24.}
 Declarations of *private* Persons, viz. of
Jos. Wyeth and *W. Penn*, which he has
 produced, tho' contrary to his own fore-
 mentioned Opinion, which declared it not
equitable to do so. But tho' these *Private*
Confessions shall be by and by reflected on,
 I will, according to the *Letter-Writer's* fore-
 said *equitable* Position, tho' neglected by
 himself, consider in the *First* place the more
Publick Declaration deliver'd by some of
 the *Quakers* to the *Parliament* in 1693, as
 recorded by their own Historian, *Sewel*.
 But here I cannot but previously Observe,
 that besides that it does not appear from * a

*—“ As a *Body of People*, they [the *Quakers*] have no
 “ Principles; being declared Enemies to all *Creeeds* or *Forms*
 “ of Words giving an Account of their Faith, which every
 “ particular Member of their Society ought publickly to
 “ profess; and without which, it is impossible, without Mi-
 “ racles, that they can know what Faith the Body of their
 “ People have; never any *Confession* of Faith having yet
 “ been *universally* received by them.” *G. Keith*, in *Post-
 script* to his *Third Narrative*, &c. p. 57. *Lond. 1698.*

very

very knowing Person, who lived *Thirty* Years among them) that the *Quakers* ever had a *Creed* that was *universally* received by their Society, or that they seem to be Friends to *Creeds* in general ; it is not pretended by their own *Historian*, that This their *more Publick* Confession of Faith was an Act of their *whole Body*, but was only Signed by *Thirty one* Persons, of which *G. Whitehead* was one. And indeed he does not affirm that it was signed and offered to the Parliament either in the Name of their *whole Body*, or that they had any such Power Delegated to them as the Representatives of their *Body*, consider'd as spread throughout the World. So that it was, in effect, a Declaration of *Thirty one private* Persons. But however that be, it will be proper to recite their *Confession* here, since so great a Stress is laid upon it. Accordingly it runs thus : “ Be it known to all that we sincerely
“ believe and confess,

“ I. THAT *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, who was
“ born of the *Virgin Mary*, is the true
“ *Messiah*, the very *Christ*, the Son of the
“ Living God, to whom all the Prophets
“ gave witness : And that we do highly va-
“ lue his Death, Sufferings, Works, Offices,
“ and Merits, for the Redemption of Man-
“ kind, together with his Laws, Doctrine,
“ and Ministry.

“ II. THAT

“ II. THAT this very *Christ* of God,
 “ who is the Lamb of God, that takes away
 “ the Sins of the World, was slain, was
 “ dead, and is alive, and lives for ever in
 “ his Divine Eternal Glory, Dominion, and
 “ Power, with the Father.

“ III. THAT the Holy Scriptures of the
 “ Old and New Testament are of Divine
 “ Authority, as being given by Inspiration
 “ of God.”

[IVth Article, which relates only to *Magistracy* and *Civil Government*, as it is omitted by the *Letter-Writer*, shall be here Postponed till it be consider'd in its due Place, since it is foreign to the present Subject.]

Now the true Meaning of this *Confession* of Faith, how *Orthodox* soever it may at first View seem to be, is justly capable of the following *Explanation*.

1. THAT the more ancient Testimonies of the Leading *Quakers*, and particularly those of *G. Whitehead*, (who was the Principal Person among them that subscribed *this* Confession) and more especially the Testimonies extracted out of his *Light and Life within*, &c. which have been cited *above*, are directly contrary to and plainly inconsistent with these more *publick* Articles of Faith. And to avoid Repetition, I Refer to the *Testimonies* as *above* cited.

“ 2. THAT

2. THAT the *Critical* Circumstances of the *Quakers* at that Juncture, in 1693, that is, as they were render'd Odious to the Publick by *G. Keith's* repeated Charge upon them of denying an *Outward* Christ; and as they were accused of *Socinianism* by *F. Bugg*, and others; (which was the particular Occasion of this their more *Publick* Confession, as is acknowledged by *Sewel* himself;) And again, as they were in Hopes of being exempted from taking *Oaths*; (as in Fact they soon were afterwards) these Circumstances, I say, which concurred at that Time, may reasonably be supposed to have influenced them in using a little Art and Disguise in their said *Confession*, and more particularly with Regard to the Phrase, "We highly value" the several *Facts* of the *outward* Christ there specified.

3. THAT the *Christian Doctrine* of the People called *Quakers*, calculated for the clearing them from the Scandal of their Divisions in *America*, &c. which was *previously* Published in the *same* Year 1693, and Signed by *Eight* Persons, (of whom *G. Whitehead* was the Chief) was justly Censurable for *Unchristian* Positions and downright *Deism*, as maintaining the *no Necessity* of the Knowledge of, or Faith in, an *Outward Christ*. Instances of which are

these; ---- "Supposing there have been, or
 " are, pious and conscientious *Gentiles*, in
 " whom *Christ* was, and is, as the *Seed* or
 " Princi-

Hist.
 p. 626.

See Sewel,
 P. 622.

" Principle of the *Second* or *new* Cove-
 " nant, &c.----- and such [as] live uprightly
 " and faithfully to that Light they have,-----
 " they cannot perish, but shall be saved,-----
 " tho' they have not the *Outward* Advan-
 " tage of *Preaching, Scripture, or thence*
 " the *Knowledge of Christ's Outward Coming,*
 " *being outwardly Crucified, and Risen from*
 " *the Dead; Can such be justly excluded*
 " *Christianity or the Covenant of Grace, or*
 " *truly deemed no Christians, &c.? Or must*
 " *all be excluded any true Knowledge or*
 " *Faith of Christ, within them, unless they*
 " *have the Knowledge of Christ as without*
 " *them? No sure, for that would imply In-*
 " *sufficiency in Christ and his Light, as*
 " *within them, &c.-----* A Man or Woman Ibid.
 " having the Life and Fruits of true Chri-
 " stianity, the Fruits of the *Spirit of Christ*
 " in them that can talk little thereof, or of
 " *Creeds, Points, or Articles of Faith,-----*
 " yet may be *true Christians in Spirit* and p. 623.
 " *Life, &c.-----* And tho' we had the Holy
 " *Scriptures* of the Old and New Testament,
 " and a Belief of *Christ crucified, &c.* we
 " never truly knew the *Mystery* thereof, *until*
 " we were turned to the *Light* of his
 " *Grace and Spirit within us; we knew*
 " not what it was to be reconciled by his
 " *Death, and saved by his Life, or what it*
 " was to know the Fellowship of his *Suffer-*
 " *ings, the Power of his Resurrection, or*
 " to be made conformable to his *Death;*
 " We

Ibid. " We knew not *until* he opened our Eyes,
 " and turned our Minds from *Darkness*, [*i. e.*
 " the *Scriptures*] *unto his own Divine Light*
 " and *Life within us*."

HENCE it appears that the Compilers of *this* Confession of Faith consider good *Moral Heathens*, or *Jews*, or *Mahometans*, as their *Fellow-Christians*; and indeed that they are obliged so to do (as I have observed before in the Case of *W. Penn.*) by their Doctrine about that *sufficient Light within*, which is common to *all Mankind*. So that *the Light in every Man that cometh into the World*, which is *Christ within*, according to them, is not only (as has been shewn before) the *Rule of Faith* to Them, when consider'd abstractedly from the peculiar *Facts* and *Doctrines* of *Christianity*, since they might have had the *Light within* tho' the *Word* had not been *Incarnate*; (which is downright *Deism*;) but all *Moral Heathens* themselves are asserted to be *true Christians* in this *Publick* Confession of Faith by the *Quakers*; which likewise is downright *Deism*. And consequently, it was highly requisite that they should Publish another, and that a *shorter* Confession, in order to Palliate their Acknowledgment of the *No Necessity* of the actual *Knowledge* of, and real *Faith* in, an *Outward Christ* in order to Salvation; the distinguishing *Facts* of whom they are, in their subsequent *Confession*, said *highly to value*: Tho' indeed it is not impossible, if those

those *Facts* be not supposed to relate principally to the *Christ within* them, but that those *Historical* Passages may be applied by them to the *Heavenly Human* Nature, or *Spiritual Manhood* (as they call it) of *Christ*, which they have frequently * asserted on other Occasions, and indeed have incidentally mentioned in this their former *Confession* in 1693; by which they may probably be supposed to elude the Acknowledgment of the *true* Human Nature of *Christ*, consider'd as actually *suffering*, and as united *Personally* to the Deity.

4. A FARTHER *Explanation* of the foresaid *Publick Confession* may justly be made from several *subsequent* Facts relating to the *Quakers*, which very much derogate from the Sincerity of that Confession. In order therefore to detect the Fallacies of their *shorter* Publick Confession in 1693, it will not be improper to consider a little how They behaved themselves on several Critical Occasions afterwards; and that in an *Historical* Manner.

THE *First* Instance I shall mention is, That of their Behaviour towards *George Keith*, the most Learned and Rational Person of their Sect. It is well known both from that Writer's † own Accounts of the previous

* See *Testimonies*, in 3d Class above, about the *Heavenly Flesh* of *Christ* as distinct from his *Earthly Flesh*.

† See *New England's Spirit of Persecution transmitted to Pennsylvania*,— in the *Trial* of *G. Keith*, &c. — Published in 1693. See

previous Transactions relating to him in *Pensylvania*, and of the violent Opposition made there to his Doctrine, as well as from * *Gerard Croese's History of Quakerism*, (who was a *Calvinistical Divine* in *Holland*, and generally more impartial on this and other Occasions, except where the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of *England* are concerned, than the *Quaker-Historian Sewel*, as well as more particular in the Rise and Progress of the *Keithian* Contest) it is clear and evident, I say, that the Great Dispute in *Pensylvania* was about the Necessity of Believing, in order to Salvation, in an *Outward Christ*, as the very Person that was born of the *Virgin Mary*, and who, as *Personally* united to the Godhead, is the true *Christ*; and that the *Light within* is not sufficient *without something else*. This Doctrine was maintained by *G. Keith* and his Followers, as *Essential* to *Christianity*; and it was opposed there by his Adversaries, as constituting *two Christs*, one *within*, and the other

See too *The Judgment given forth by 28 Quakers against G. Keith and his Friends, with Answers to the said Judgment, &c. and an Appeal to the Yearly Meeting, Sept. 1692. And likewise an Account of the said Yearly Meeting, Signed by Seventy Quakers, who Acquitted G. Keith, &c. Printed at Pensylvania, and Reprinted at London, 1694.*

* *Vid. Gerardi Croesi Historiam Quakerianam, Amstel. 1695. 8°. viz. in English thus; "Keith did not cease to inculcate upon all Persons, that Christ as he was born of Mary was united to the Divine Nature.—Others therefore made opposition to these Opinions of Keith" and*

other *without* *. And for this, as his distinguishing Doctrine, G. Keith was barbarously treated, and condemned by a Minority, and that too in Opposition to a greater Number that Acquitted him afterwards. From his Enemies there he Returned into *England* in 1693 or 94. Upon his Return he maintained the same Doctrine of an *outward Christ* as *absolutely necessary* to Salvation, and accordingly (after great Opposition from the other *Quakers*) was *Excommunicated* by their *Body*, and stiled an *Apostate* by W. Penn himself in 1695. So that two Years after the Date of the foremention'd Confession made by G. Whitehead and his Brethren, in

" and his Party, and more especially to that Article about
 " the Divine and Human Nature of *Christ*; which Article
 " of Faith was openly confessed by Keith to be peculiarly
 " his own." — To which Article his Adversaries Objected
 " that out of One *Christ* he made Two. p. 246, 247.

* " The Subject of Dispute [namely, in the General Anniversary Assembly at *Philadelphia* in the Year 1691.] was
 " this, Whether to preach Faith in *Christ* as he is *within*
 " Man, and in *Christ* as he is *without* Man, was the same
 " thing as to preach *Two Christs*." Ibid. p. 450.

* " Keith pretended that his Doctrine about this Article is
 " so necessary to be known and believed, that *Christianity*
 " it self depended on it; and that to deny this Article is
 " the same thing as to deny the *Passion* and *Death* of *Christ*,
 " and even *Christ* himself, &c. Ibid.

* " As for the *Human Nature* of *Christ*, Some Persons
 " [viz. some of the Adversaries of Keith's Opinions] determined that *Christ* did not Rise again, nor ascend into
 " Heaven, as he was born of *Mary* and suffered on the Cross.
 " Others were of Opinion that *Christ* raised again that Body
 " out of the Sepulchre, but laid it aside in his *Ascension* into
 " Heaven." Ibid. p. 448. [He adds, that " some gave such
 " an Account (there specified) of the *invisible State*, and
 " of the *Resurrection*, as was equivalent to their denying any
 " other Heaven and Hell than those *within* Men. Ib p. 449.

G

which

p. 618.

which they pretended so highly to value the distinguishing *Facts* of Christ, we find that G. Keith was *Excommunicated* by their Society, for maintaining the *Necessity* of believing in an *outward Christ* in order to Salvation. And even from the *Christian Doctrine* of the *Quakers* recorded in *Sewel*, which that *Historian* acknowledges was drawn up and Published in 1693, (as they found themselves obliged to answer G. Keith's Charge upon them,) it has been already shewn that they asserted the *Christianity* of *Moral Heathens*, and that they are capable of Salvation by the *Light of Christ within*, without any *Historical Knowledge* of, and actual Faith in, the *outward Jesus*; and consequently, that there is *no Necessity* for that Knowledge and Faith. On this Occasion too it ought to be recollected, that, notwithstanding the frequent *Challenges* of G. Keith that were sent to the *Quakers* to hold Conferences with him, and to Answer his foresaid Charge upon them, which he offer'd to prove out of their Own *Writings*, he could not prevail with them to meet him, either at *Turners-Hall*, or at *Oxford*, or Elsewhere; for their not Meeting him at the former of which Places, they published in 1696 some very weak Reasons, even as they are recorded in *Sewel's History*. However, those Proofs, extracted out of their most eminent Writers, were exhibited and

p 636.

Attested

Attested there, in 1698 and 1700, by the very Credible Witnesses before-mentioned, which fully confirm the Justness of his Charge upon them. And as to the same Challenge of the *Quakers* at Oxford to a Conference with him, in the Year 1700, where many Gentlemen of that University were assembled to hear the proposed Debate; (some of whom no doubt are now living,) it is certain that *G. Keith* exhibited before them his unanswerable *Authorities* out of the Original Writings of the *Quakers*, in Justification of the same Charge upon them; and that he afterwards * published his *Answers* to the *Queries* sent to him by the *Quakers* of that Place, and round about, who Declined appearing there before him and a learned Audience in a publick manner, tho' in their own Vindication. So that the Behaviour of the *Quakers*, even *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, their most eminent Leaders at that Time, in Concurrence with their other Brethren, in obstinately refusing to hear the Proofs offer'd against them by *G. Keith*, is a Confession of the Truth of his Charge upon them; namely, That they deny the *Necessity* of the Knowledge of, and Faith in, an *Outward Christ*, in order to *Salvation*, in a firm Dependence on the *Sufficiency* of the *Light within without any thing else*: Which is a Scheme of *Infidelity* that evacuates the Gospel as effectually, as

the most explicit System of *Deism* can possibly do.

ANOTHER Instance I shall produce on this Occasion is the well-known Case of Dr. *Lancaster's Seven Queries* proposed (in 1695) to the *Quaker's* Yearly Meeting in *London*; and consequently, after the Time that their foresaid *Confession* of Faith was exhibited to the *Parliament*. Now as these *Queries* related entirely to their Belief or Disbelief of an *Outward Christ*, and the particular Circumstances of him, to which their plain *Yea* or *Nay* was desired, and that too in order to clear themselves from the Imputation of Disbelieving an *Outward Christ*, or at least throwing great *Contempt* upon him; so it is very Observable in their Conduct that no Answer at all from their *General Assembly* was obtained; and that afterwards, when their *Committee of Seven* gave an Answer (of whom *G. Whitehead* was again the Principal Person) it was not made as was desired by particular *Yeas* or *Nays*, upon a vain Pretence, "That divers of the *Queries* contained several Questions in them, in different Terms, (and some unscriptural) so not plain and direct *Queries*; and therefore, say they, cannot Positively be Answer'd by our single *Yea* or *Nay* to each *Query* as desired. We therefore (add they) at present send this *General Answer* to the *Queries* for thy Information, &c." As for their *General Answer* it self, I choose rather

ther to * Refer to it than to transcribe it, as being of too great a Length for this Place. But I cannot but Observe, that the said Answer is couched in such *general* Terms, as by no Means to come up to the particular *Queries* that were proposed to them; that they acknowledge indeed the Existence and Facts of an *Outward* Christ, but not in Terms strong enough to evince the *Necessity* of believing in him in order to Salvation, or to preclude all Suspensions of what was laid to their Charge by the Doctor on that Occasion; which indeed was fully proved upon them by *G. Keith* in his plain and direct *Reply* to their *Answer*, out of the printed Books of *G. Whitehead*, *W. Penn*, and Others, in his Treatise intitled, *Gross Error and Hypocrisy detected in G. Whitehead and some of his Brethren*, in which the Inconsistency and Contradiction of their *Answer* to the express Language and Sentiments of their former Writers is fully Exposed. And it is very remarkable, that how difficult soever to be directly Answer'd those *Queries* were found by *G. Whitehead* and his Brethren in *London*, they were Answer'd *directly*, and in the Terms of

* See Answer to Dr. Lancaster's *Queries*, both in *G. Whitehead's Antidote*, &c. p. viii. and in *G. Keith's Reply* to their Answer in his *Gross Error and Hypocrisy detected*, &c. *Lond.* 1695.

Yea and *Nay* the very same Year, by the more *Christian Quakers* at *Philadelphia*, who adhered to the Reformed Principles of *G. Keith*, and were of his Party there; which the Other Sett of *Quakers* there declined to do. And whether plainer *Queries* can possibly be put, and consequently whether a plain and direct Answer might not have been given by the *Quakers* at *London*, as well as by those at *Philadelphia*, if the one had been as real *Christians* as the other, must be left to every competent Reader of them * to determine.

5. WHAT is decisive of the Insincerity of those *Thirty one Quakers* that signed the foresaid *Confession* of Faith which was offer'd to the *Parliament* in 1693, is, that some inconsistent Declarations were made by their *Body*, or at least by the Representatives of it, after the Date of their said *Publick Confession*; namely, that they still adhere to the *Doctrines* and *Testimonies* of their *Predecessors* from the very Beginning. This Declaration is extant in their *Yearly Epistle* in 1696, the express Words of which are these; "We cannot but recommend to you the holding up the *Holy Testimony of Truth*, which hath made Us a People to God, and preserved Us so unto this Day, and that in all the

* See them in *Lefley's 1. Def. in Collect.* p. 12. and in *G. Keith's Gross Error, &c.*

“Parts of it; for Truth is one, and changes
 “not; and what it convinced Us of to be
 “evil in the Beginning, it reproves still.
 “And therefore, Dear Friends, be zealous
 “and strict for the Lord’s Blessed Testi-
 “mony, &c.”

AND in their *Yearly Epistle* in 1699,
 they write thus; “As we have been under
 “a Godly Concern to exhort one another
 “to abide therein, and to persevere in Faith-
 “fulness and Sincerity in our *Antient and*
 “*Christian Testimony*, in all the several
 “Parts thereof; so We tenderly exhort
 “you, in the Love of God, in your re-
 “spective Meetings to take effectual Care
 “therein, that all may be so preserved to the
 “End.”

IN the *Post-Man*, 14th Jan. 1699. in
 Answer to some Accounts published about a
 Dispute in Norfolk, &c. the Quakers, in Be-
 half of their Body, published the following
 Passage; — “The Quakers not questioning
 “but to acquit their *ancient Friends* and
 “their *Writings* from those black Charges,
 “[viz. of *Blasphemy*, &c.] not being con-
 “scious of *Deviating* in any one Point
 “of *Doctrine*, from what they first held.”

FROM these Declarations it plainly ap-
 pears, that as they have found out the Art of
 Reconciling the Acknowledgment of the
 Facts of an outward Christ with those Testi-
 monies and Doctrines of their Predecessors
 which have been exhibited before, and are

glaringly inconsistent with the *Necessity* of their *Belief* of them; they have made themselves *Answerable* for them, as their *Predecessors* either *Denied*, or *Allegorically* evacuated, those *Facts*, or threw that *Contempt* upon them as to render them *unnecessary* to be believed in order to *Salvation*. And indeed that they still persist in adhering to their *antient* *Doctrines* and *Testimonies*, is evident from their later *Boasts* and *Triumphs* * over the *Keithians* among them, as a Party entirely subdued.

6. As it has been shewn in the several *Setts* of *Testimonies* above, taken out of *Quaker*-Authors, that there are *high* and *low* Degrees of *Quakerism*, or that they are more or less *Reformed*, or that they are either *Foxonians* or *Keithians*, (tho' they have in *Words* *Disowned* and *Renounced* *G. Keith* and his *Doctrine*) the whole *Body* of the *Quakers* is not to be charged either with the fore said *Confession* of *Faith*, or with the *Fallacious Arts* that may justly be supposed to have been used in the *Interpretation* of it. And therefore to avoid too long a *Repetition*, I shall here only *Observe* farther, that the several *Setts* of *Quakers* are to be *Referr'd* to the several *Setts* of *Testimonies* as above produced. Those that adhere to the *First* Class of

* See their *Yearly Epistles* in 1702, 1703, 1706, &c. upon that Subject.

Testimonies must be Referr'd to them; that is, They that give great Suspensions of their not Believing at all the *Facts* of an *outward Christ*, could not possibly sign the said Publick *Confession* without gross Prevarication, as meaning the *Heavenly Human Nature*, and not the *Earthly Manhood of Christ* that was born of the *Virgin Mary*, &c. Such Persons indeed are *self-condemned*. Those among the *Quakers* that seem to acknowledge an *outward Christ*, and his Performances at *Jerusalem*, &c. as the Subscribers to the *Parliamentary Confession* above seem to do, are here Referr'd to the *Second Class of Testimonies*, in which the *contrary Declarations* of the *Old Quakers*, and particularly of *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, their greatest *Leaders* when that *Confession* was made, are a sufficient *Detection* of the *Fallacies* and *Sophistry* that were used in that Publick *Confession*. And indeed both They and Others who *Allegorize away the Literal Sense* of the said Articles of Faith in an *outward Christ*; or highly *Derogate* from, or rather *Deny*, the *Necessity* of Believing them in order to *Salvation*, as depending on the *Sufficiency* of the *Light within them without something else*; are properly here Referr'd to the *Third Class of Testimonies* as *above*, for a *Confutation* of the *Sincerity* of those that signed the fore said Publick *Confession*. And to be as short as may be, the like *Reference* is to be made about the *Inspiration*

piration of the H. Scriptures; which as several of their Leaders derogate from, or Deny, or Revile in the *Fourth Class* of *Testimonies*, so Others claim *Inspiration* to themselves in the very same Degree with that of the *Scriptures*.

INDEED the same *Compendious Method* shall be here used with regard to the *Private Confessions* of Faith that were made by *W. Penn*, *G. Whitehead*, *Jos. Wyeth*, or Others, that are cited by the *Letter-writer*, and the Author of *The Cloud* &c. For they are not only consider'd by the former of those Adversaries as of no *Authority* because *private*, and not *Acts* of their *Society*, and therefore are absurdly cited by him against the *B. of L.* but the particular *Confessions*, of *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, as cited by both those Authors, are fully Answer'd by *their own Testimonies* which are ranged in the several *Classes* above. Which Inconsistencies with themselves it is not my Business here to labour to Reconcile; neither is it possible to do so, but by the help of those little Evasive Arts that were used by *Jos. Wyeth*, and are so fully Exposed in *Mr. Lesley's* unanswerable *Reply* to him: Arts, that are so very unworthy of that *Simplicity* to which the *Quakers* make such loud Pretensions, as to serve only to Confirm the Charge upon them of their *loss* of *true Christianity*; to which such Fallacies, practised

See *Let.*
p. 24, 21,
11, 12.

See *Cloud*.
p. 29, 17,
21, 27, &c.

See
p. 24, 21,
11, 12.

See
p. 24, 21,
11, 12.

practised on the most Sacred Subjects, are a direct Contradiction; except in the Sense of *W. Penn*, who expressly informs his Reader that his *Confession*, which is cited by the Letter-writer, was for the use of the Simple-hearted; which may most justly be understood in the other more obvious Sense of the Word, namely, for those that were weak enough to be imposed on by him in that Confession of the *Facts* of an *Outward* Christ; that is, with a secret Reserve of the *no necessity* of that *Belief*; tho' the *Belief* of Christ *within* was said by him to be *sufficient* as well as *necessary*, as appears in the *Testimonies* cited above. And indeed it is *Observable*, that in the *Page* immediately before his acknowledgment of the *Facts* of an *Outward* Christ, our *Justification* by the Righteousness of an *outward* Christ is opposed by him. This surely looks oddly, and is inconsistent with his *Confession*.

7. THE true Meaning of the forefaid Publick *Confession* of Faith will be Confirmed, and more clearly Illustrated, by forming a Comparison of the *Confession* of Faith made by *Henry Nicholas*, the Head of the *Familists*, in his *Gospel of the Kingdom*, and his other Treatises, with the *Quaker-Confession*, both with regard to its *Literal* and *Mystical* Sense and Interpretation. I say, the Head of the *Familists*; for tho' *David George* antecedently to *Henry Nicholas*, taught many of the same Doctrines

See *Ser. Apol.* p. 149.
p. 24.

Ser. Apol. p. 148.

See
D. George's
Story,
Printed in
as 1559.

as he did, and pretended to Act entirely by the *Spirit of Christ* as given to himself, and indeed *Spiritualized away* the *Gospel of Christ*, and particularly flurred the *two Sacraments* as suited to *Children*, till he himself should come; and as * *Charinaeus*, a *Dutch Divine*, assures us, he took away all *Rites instituted by Christ*, and by his *Office of the H. Ghost* taught *Perfection*, and *abolished* them as *imperfect*; yet he did not carry on his *Mystical Scheme* to that degree of *Perfection* as *Henry Nicholas* did, who refined much upon his Master. And therefore dismissing *David George*, as only introductory to *Henry Nicholas*, I shall give a more particular Account of the Doctrine of the latter, as the Original of *Quakerism*. Indeed the *Letter-Writer* does

See *Let.*
P. 4.

not think fit to "enquire what the *Mystical Scheme* of the *Familists* was:" But since the *B. of L.* has not improbably conjectured that the *Heads* of the *Quakers* borrowed their *Mystical Scheme* from the *Heads* of the *Familists*, and the *Letter-Writer* pretends it is possible "the *B. of L.* may be mistaken concerning the *Scheme* of the *Familists*, and therefore
Ibid. p. 5, "may be so too concerning the *Quakers*,
6. "who are said by him to have borrowed
"it of the *Familists*; and that, consequent-

* See *Charinaeus's* Confutation of *David George* and *H. N.* at the End of *Knewstubs's* Treatise against *H. Nicholas*.

“ly the B. of L. should have produced
 “some *Authorities* to support his Charges
 “on both those Schemes:” I cannot think
 it improper, in *Vindication* of the B. of
 L. to shew how *H. Nicholas* has *Allegorized*
away every Article of the *Apostles Creed*, in
 order to shew that the *Quakers*, in imitation
 of, and perfect Agreement with him, have
 done the very same. Indeed *H. N.* uses
 all the *Scripture-Expressions* of the *Creed*
 as well as the *Quakers*, and yet has a *Myf-*
tical Meaning for every Article which eva-
 cuates the *Literal* Sense. But before I pro-
 ceed to the several Articles of the *Creed* as
mystically explained by *H. N.* I shall *Pre-*
mise two or three Passages out of him,
 which evince, in general, the good Agree-
 ment of *H. Nicholas* with *G. Fox* and O-
 ther *Quaker-Leaders*.

H. Nicholas (in his *Gospel of the King-*
dom, c. 32.) says, “That to those that are
 “out of the *Family of Love*, the Matters
 “of *Christianity* to them are in *Images*,
 “*Figures*, and *Shadows*, in *Similitudes*,
 “*Parables*, and *closed Books*.” As likewise,
 (c. 30. Sect. 17. *ibid.*) “These *Figures*, he
 “says, are *Shadows* of the *True* and *Spiri-*
 “*tual* things which were heretofore, through
 “*Jesus Christ*, come to pass, *seen*, *heard*, and
 “*preach’d*, and have stood for a *Memorial*
 “of the *true Spiritual* things which
 “*should*, in the time to come, come to
 “*pass*.”----- Again (c. 13. *ibid.*) he speaks
 thus;

thus; " That a Man out of his Natural
 " and *Scripture-learned* Understanding has
 " not any Light or Knowledge at all of the
 " *Christian Mystery*; yea, he is so utterly
 " void of the same, that he cannot under-
 " stand the smallest Tittle thereof: He
 " may indeed speak out of the *Written-*
 " *word*, but understandeth nothing thereof
 " according to the *Truth*; but it is all
 " *Covered* and *Sealed* before him in Simili-
 " tudes, Images, *Figures*, and Parables."
 Which are Expressions and Sentiments that
 exactly tally with those of the Leading
Quakers, in the *Testimonies* above, even up-
 on the most superficial *Comparison* of them.

H. N. (in his 1st *Exhortation*, c. 15.
 f. 10.) says; " The *unilluminated* unsent
 " Teachers, busie and apply themselves ve-
 " ry earnestly about the profound Know-
 " ledge of the *Scriptures*; ---- but they are
 " a Nest of Devils and all wicked Spirits.---
 " The Riches of the Knowledge in all false
 " Hearts, of the *Scripture-learned*, ---- is
 " the false Spirit of *Antichrist*, which
 " through his shew of *outward Holiness*,
 " and great *Knowledge* in the *Scripture*,
 " worketh a secret Iniquity, &c." ---- And
 (in c. 16. sect. 17.) H. N. speaks thus; " —
 " It is assuredly all false and Lies, seducing
 " and deceitful, what the ungodly or *unil-*
 " *luminated* Men, out of the Imagination
 " or Riches of their own Knowledge, or
 " out of the *learnedness* of the *Scriptures*
 " bring

[III]

" bring forth, institute, preach, and teach :
 " They preach indeed the *Letter* and Ima-
 " gination of their Knowledge, but not *the*
 " *Word* of the living God. ---- Doubtless
 " all ---- the Word that they use, is ---- a
 " false *Christianity*, and Devil's Synagogue
 " or School."

I now go on to produce several Passa-
 ges of *H. N.* which shew the *Agreement* of
 the *Familists* and *Quakers*, in those Arti-
 cles of the *Creed* that relate to *Jesus Christ*.
H. N. (in his *Gospel of the Kingdom*, Sect.
 13.) speaks thus; " We Believe in *Jesus*
 " *Christ*, the only Son of God our Lord."
 And yet he makes Christ to be a *State* and
 not a *Person*, to be *Righteousness* and *Per-*
fection: (c. 13. sect. 2. *ibid.*) as likewise he
 says, " That This same *true Light* is the
 " *anointed* with the Holy Ghost, *Messias*,
 " and *Christ*." (Sect. 10. *ibid.*) And in his
Prophecy of the Spirit of Love, (c. 15.
 sect. 5.) he says plainly, " That this State
 " of *Perfection*, which is there stiled the
 " *Second Birth*, is *Christ Jesus* the Lord
 " and Saviour." And (c. 31. sect. 19. of
 his *Gospel*) he says; " The *Second Birth*
 " bringeth forth the Name of *Israel* or
 " *Christ* it self." So again says he, " We
 " believe that the same *Son of God* is con-
 " ceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of
 " the *H. Virgin Mary*. We confess that
 " this same *Son of God*, which is conceiv-
 " ed of the Holy Ghost, and born of the *H.*
 " *Virgin*

“ Virgin *Mary*, is the true and *promised*
 “ *Seed*, &c. ” Indeed the Word, *is*, instead
 of, *was*, betrays the Sophistry here used, as
 implying that *Christ's Conception* is not al-
 together *past* ; since in those that are brought
 to his State of *Perfection* and *New Birth*,
 so often *is Christ conceived of the Holy*
Ghost.---- In c. 18. sect. 10. where *H. N.*
 treats at large of the *History of Christ*, he
 writes thus ; “ Consider, ye Beloved, how
 “ that there is shewed unto us, and given
 “ us to understand, through the Speeches
 “ of the Angel *Gabriel* which he used with
 “ *Mary* ; that at the same time (when the
 “ *H. Ghost* came through the Power of the
 “ Most Highest upon the Virgin *Mary*,
 “ and procreated the true *Seed of Promise*)
 “ the time of procreating of the *Seed of*
 “ *Abraham* according to the *Flesh*, turned
 “ *it self about* : To wit, that the Holy and
 “ True *Seed of Abraham* should not from
 “ thenceforth be *conceived* of the *Flesh*, but
 “ of the *H. Ghost*, through the Power of
 “ the Most Highest in the *Belief* ; and
 “ that the same should even so be *born* out
 “ out of the true Faith of *Abraham*. For
 “ the *Seed* out of the *Faith of Abraham*,
 “ and out of the pure Virgin *Mary*, is the
 “ true *Seed of Promise* to the Blessing of
 “ all Generations of the Earth. ---- The
 “ upright Children of the *Belief*, which
 “ had their Descent out of the *Seed* of the
 “ *Faith of Abraham*, and the pure Virgin
 “ *Mary*,

" *Mary*, as also from the *H. Ghost*, were
 " known to be the *true Seed* of *Abraham* ;
 " because the *same Seed* was the *Seed* of
 " the *Promise* of God the Father ; and was
 " likewise in his Mind, according to the
 " *Spirit*, the *likeness* of God his Father,
 " also *Spirit* and *Spiritual* of the Godly
 " Nature and Being, &c."

AGAIN *H. N.* (in 4th Article of his
Gospel) speaks thus ; " We believe that this
 " *Holy Seed* of *Blessing*, namely, this same
 " only Son of God *Jesus Christ*, Our Lord
 " and Saviour, the very like Being of God
 " the Father, *bath suffered* under *Pontius*
 " *Pilate*, was *Crucified*, *Dead*, and *Bu-*
 " *ried*, and *descended* to the *Hell*. We
 " confess that this same Son of God,
 " inasmuch as he beareth all things with
 " the Word of his own Power, *beareth al-*
 " *so in us our Sins*." And (in his 1st *Ex-*
 " *hortation* c. 19.) he speaks thus ; " Through
 " which Daily God-Service and *Offering*
 " in the *Holy*, [i. e. *Mystically*, and *with-*
 " *in us*] in the taking up of our Cross in
 " the Imitation of Christ in his *Death*, we
 " obtain the *Remission* of *Sins*." And (in
 " his *Gospel*, c. 12. sect. 7.) *H. N.* ex-
 " plains himself thus ; " The *Belief*, out
 " of the Power of God, *became with Child*
 " through the *H. Ghost*, and bare or
 " brought forth a *New Man*, or a *New*
 " *Creature*, according to the very like Be-
 " ing of the Heavenly Godhead, &c. ---

H

" For

" For this is the *right Procreation*, to the
 " renewing of the *Spirit* and Mind of the
 " Believers, and is also the *True New Testa-*
 " *tament, &c.* ---- That same *New Testa-*
 " *ment* is in his Children, the *Heaven*, the
 " Seat of the Most Highest, also *Spirit* and
 " *Life*; and for that Cause it is with his
 " Children, *Heavenly, Spiritual*, and Liv-
 " ingly-minded, &c. " ---- Again (c. 20.
 sect. 3. of his *Exhortation*) *H. N.* speaks
 thus; " The Man ought in his youngness
 " [*i. e. H. N.'s young Scholar*] to learn to
 " take up his Cross on him, to follow af-
 " ter Christ in his like Suffering or Death
 " of the Cross, ---- until ---- he even so is
 " grown up, through the *Death* or toge-
 " ther-Suffering of Christ, which is the
 " *Daily Oblation* in the *Holy*, to the Old
 " Age of the *Man Christ*, and entred
 " through the *Second Birth* from the
 " *Dead*, into the *Everlasting Life, &c.* "----
 Again (in his *Gospel*, c. 21.) after he had
 mentioned Christ's *Literal Passover*, he
 says thus; " Christ gave his Disciples to
 " understand in what manner his *Passover*
 " should be; to wit, that he, namely,
 " *Christ after the Flesh*" (or the *Letter and*
History, as explained by him in his *Pro-*
phēcy of the Spirit of Love, c. 13. v. 4.)
 " should be slain, and even so accomplish,
 " according to the *true Being* the *true*
 " God-Service, with the Gift or *Offering*
 " of his *Flesh* in the *Holy, &c.* ---- Here-
 " with

“ with *Christ* shewed unto his Disciples,
 “ how or in what manner his *Flesh* must be
 “ offered and given over to a *Life* of Men,
 “ and that they all even so, which in the
 “ Belief of their Safe-making from their
 “ Sins, eat his *Flesh*, and followed after
 “ him even to the *Second Birth*, should
 “ have the *Life* in fullness, in all Godly
 “ clearness according to the *Spirit*. Be-
 “ hold this is the upright *Passover* with
 “ *Christ*, or the right *Supper*, which the
 “ upright Believers and Disciples of *Christ*
 “ keep with *Christ*; to wit, that they de-
 “ part even so with *Christ* out of the *Flesh*,
 “ [or *Letter* and *History* of *Christ* which is
 “ *Crucified* and *Slain* in them,] into the
 “ *Spirit*, [or *Spiritual Mystery* of *Christ*]
 “ and out of the *Death*, [or *Dead Letter*]
 “ into the *Eternal Life* &c.” [or State of
Perfection kept up among the *Familists* for
 ever.] --- And (in *H. N.’s Introduction*, c. 8.
 38.) he asks ; “ Where do any now keep
 “ the *Supper* of *Christ*, where they break, dis-
 “ tribute, and eat the Bread to a Remem-
 “ brance of *Christ*, that he hath suffered
 “ in us for the Sins that caused the *Death*
 “ of the Cross, and so his *Death* is published
 “ till he come in his *Glory* ? ” [i. e. in the
Spirit.]

THE same Account *H. N.* gives of
Christian Baptism, as just now of the
Lord’s Supper. For (under the 4th Arti-
 cle of his *Creed*, *ibid.*) he speaks thus ;

" That we should *follow after* Christ, and
 " become *Incorporated* to him with his
 " *like* Death, and *Baptized* or *washed* un-
 " der the Obedience of the *Belief in his*
 " *Name*,---- to the end that We might
 " *even so* through *Jesus Christ* obtain
 " the *Renewing* of our *Spirit* and *Mind*,
 " in an upright *Life*, and the *Resur-*
 " *rection from the Dead*," [i. e. in the *Mo-*
 " *ral* Sense.] ---- " This *Incorporation* is the
 " upright *Christian Baptism*, in the *Name*
 " *of the Son*, and is the true *Forgiveness*
 " and *Purging* of our Sins through *Jesus*
 " *Christ*. ---- And all such as do not imi-
 " tate Christ in the *Death* of the Cross, ----
 " or become even not *so Baptized*, are no
 " *Christians*, nor yet *baptized in the Name*
 " or *Salvation of the Son*, &c."

AGAIN (in the 5th Article of *H. N.'s*
Creed) he speaks thus ; " We Believe that
 " the God of *Abraham* hath raised up his
 " Son *Jesus* from the Dead, and that he
 " even so the Third Day rose again from
 " the Dead ; and appeared, or made mani-
 " fest himself, unto his Friends which
 " loved him, shewing unto them, through
 " his Suffering and Death on the Cross,
 " the Victory over the Sin, Death, Devil,
 " Hell, the Flesh, and the World." But
 tho' the last Expressions are doubtful as to
 the *Resurrection* of the *true Body* of Christ,
 yet *H. N.* has explained himself more clear-
 ly in the 22d C. of his *Gospel* ; viz. " That
 " *Jesus*

“ *Jesus Christ* was found faithful in the
 “ *Death* of his *Cross*, ---- to a true *Passio-*
 “ *ver* out of the *Flesh* [or *Letter*] into the
 “ *making alive* according to the *Spirit*.----
 “ He set himself, according to the *Spirit*,
 “ at the *Right hand* of God his Father, in the
 “ *Heavenly* [or *Mystical*] Being.---- He af-
 “ *ter* the *Spirit*, and according to the
 “ *Truth* of the *Heavenly Godhead*, is an
 “ *everlasting* and *true Christ* of God.” ----
 [So that he is not a true Christ, but ac-
 cording to the *Spirit*.] “ ---- And Christ, af-
 “ *ter* the *Spirit*, appeared unto his Disci-
 “ *ples* out of the *Heavenly Being*.”

AGAIN (in *H. N.*'s 6th Article of the
Creed) he speaks thus ; “ We Believe that
 “ this same *Jesus* (like as the *Scripture* men-
 “ tioneth thereof) is *Ascended* into *Hea-*
 “ *ven*, sitting at the *Right Hand* of God
 “ his *Almighty Father*. We Confess that
 “ he has *taken* in the *Heaven*, and reign-
 “ eth and ruleth *essentially* in the *Heaven-*
 “ *ly Being* with his Father, until that all
 “ his *Enemies* be laid under his *Feet*.”
 How *Christ*, according to *H. N.* sits at the
Right hand of God, has been shewn in the
 very last Quotation of him, viz. *Spiritu-*
ally. And that all the rest of the Article
 was meant by him in the *Spiritual* Sense
 appears from his *Gospel*, (c. 26. sect.
 10.) where he speaks thus ; “ With the
 “ *Disciples* of *Christ* there was a *Spiri-*
 “ *tual Heavenly Priesthood*, [that] ap-
 “ *peared*

“ peared in upright Righteousness, and
 “ even so was the same with his Service,
 “ established on *Christ after the Spirit,*
 “ the true Light ; which Service of the
 “ *Spiritual* and Heavenly Ministrations,
 “ cometh not to pass in the Letter, nor in
 “ the Figures, [of the Law] but in the
 “ very true Being : Behold, even so was
 “ *Christ after the Spirit,* in his Office or
 “ Service, a Minister of the very true and
 “ Heavenly Goods, among his Disciples
 “ and Believers ; and hath, when he had
 “ taken in the Heaven, multiplied himself
 “ through his Seed of the H. Ghost, out of
 “ the Heavenly Being, to the increasing of
 “ his Generation the upright Seed of Abra-
 “ ham, according to the Promises, --- all
 “ which *Christ made alive through his H.*
 “ *Ghost,* taking them up from the Earth, and
 “ assembling them unto him at the Right
 “ hand of God, his Father in the Heavenly
 “ Being.” All which dark Expressions
 amount to this ; That H. N.’s *Jesus*
 being free from Sin, and the Knowledge of
 the Word after the Letter, he is now be-
 come altogether Heavenly and *Spiritual,*
 inspired with Knowledge immediately from
 God himself. For his *Christ after the Spi-*
rit is H. N. himself, and all that his Num-
 ber, who are by Obedience unto his Doc-
 trine, grown to such Perfection that now
 they Sin no more, being replenished with
 the Fullness of the H. Spirit of God. And
 he

he means no other *Ascending into Heaven*, nor any other *taking in of the Heaven*.

AGAIN *H. N.* (in the 7th Article of his *Creed*) speaks thus; "We Believe that *Jesus Christ* shall come from thence, (namely, from the *Right hand of God* his Father, out of Heaven) to Judge the Living and the Dead:" But the true meaning of this is explained by himself; for (in his *Gospel*, c. 34.) he speaks thus; "Behold and Consider, my Beloved, how wonderfully God worketh in his Holy ones; and how that now in this Day, or *Light of the Love*, the *Judgment-Seat of Christ* is revealed and Declared unto us, out of Heaven, to a righteous Judgment upon Earth, from the *Right hand of God*; and how that on the same *Judgment-Seat of Christ* (that the *Scripture* might be fulfilled) there sitteth one now [viz. *H. N.* himself] in Truth in the Habitation of *David*, which *Judgeth* uprightly, thinketh upon Equity, and requireth Righteousness. Through him God will now in this Day, which he himself hath appointed or ordained thereunto, Judge the compass of the Earth with Righteousness: &c."

AND as to the other Articles that immediately relate to this last Subject (for all the rest that do not so, tho' full of *Allegories*, I here omit) viz. the *Resurrection of the Body*, and the *Life Everlasting*; tho'

he speaks thus of both ; “ We Believe the
 “ Resurrection of the Flesh, and We Be-
 “ lieve one *Everlasting Life* ; ” yet what the
 former is he explains in a *Spiritual* Sense
 (in his *Gospel* c. 35.) thus ; “ Behold in
 “ this *present Day* is this Scripture fulfil-
 “ led ; and according to the Testimony
 “ of the *Scripture*, the *Raising up the*
 “ *Dead*, and the *Resurrection of the Lord's*
 “ *Dead* cometh also to pass *presently* in
 “ this *same Day* through the appearing
 “ of the *coming of Christ* in his Ma-
 “ jesty : Which *Resurrection of the Dead*,
 “ seeing that the same is come unto us
 “ from God's Grace, We do likewise in
 “ this *present Day* publish in all the World.
 “ ----- In which *Resurrection of the Dead*,
 “ God sheweth unto us, that the Time is
 “ now fulfilled, that his *Dead*, (or the
 “ *Dead* that are fallen asleep in the Lord)
 “ rise up in this *Day* of his *Judgment*, and
 “ appear unto us in Godly Glory ; which
 “ shall also from henceforth live in us
 “ everlastingly with *Christ* and reign upon
 “ the Earth.” [Which is plainly exclusive
 of any other *Judgment* or *Resurrection* in
 the *Literal* Sense.] And again (in his
Gospel, c. 39.) H. N. speaks, if possible,
 more plainly thus ; “ After this *Day*, there
 “ shall no *Day* of *Grace* come upon the
 “ Earth, because all the Works of God and
 “ his *Prophecies* become fulfilled according
 “ to the *Scripture* in the same. And for that
 “ the

“the Righteous Judgment of God, to an
 “*everlasting* Death and Damnation of all
 “ungodly, and to an *eternal* Life and Sal-
 “vation of all the Holy ones and Elect of
 “God, *becometh also executed therein.*”-----
 Again (in *H. N.’s Gospel*, C. 34. Sect. 4.)
 he says; “In *this same Day*, or *last Time*,
 “(namely, in the *Perfection* of the Works
 “of God, and in his Righteous Judgment)
 “the God of Heaven hath now Declared
 “himself, and his *Christ*, together with all
 “his *Saints*, to us his Elect, also made a
 “Dwelling with us, — to an *everlasting*
 “fast-standing *Jerusalem*, — *according to the*
 “*Scripture*; the which is the very *true*
 “*undisturbable* Kingdom, --- wherein the
 “Laud of the Lord with Fulness of *eternal*
 “*Life* is sung from *Everlasting to Ever-*
 “*lasting.*” — [i. e. *H. N.’s Doctrine of Per-*
 “*fection*, &c. shall be *always* preserved upon
 “Earth.] Again (in his *Gospel*, 37. 13.)
 he says; “*This Day*, or *Light* of the
 “*Love*, --- is the *Last Day*, and the
 “*Perfection* or *Conclusion* of all the
 “Works of God, in the which God
 “himself, with his *Christ*, and with *all*
 “*the Thousands of his Saints*, — *appeareth*
 “and *cometh* unto the Believers, --- to an
 “*eternal* Rest of his Holy Ones, --- where-
 “in we inherit the Fulness of the *Life*,
 “to an *everlasting* Joy, with God and his
 “*Christ.* --- The Service of *Love* --- which
 “the

"the Lord hath erected --- shall stand fast
 "Everlastingly, in his Ministration, and
 "remain for ever, according to the Scrip-
 "ture." So that upon the whole, *H. N.*
 has turned *Heaven* into *Earth*, and the *Re-
 surrection* of the *Body* into a *Moral* one of
 the *Mind*, and made *everlasting Life* to
 consist in the Continuance of his Doctrine,
 or *Service of Love*, (as he calls it) for
 ever in *this Life*, tho' by an *endless Succes-
 sion* of his Disciples. And consequently
H. N. has wholly *Allegorized away* both
Christ and *Christianity*. According to *H. N.*
 Here is our *Heaven*, and here is our *Hell*;
 the *Resurrection* is not *corporal* or of the
Body, but *Spiritual* of the *Mind*: Now
 is *Christ* come to *Judgment*, and this Doc-
 trine is the *last Trump*; they are *risen*
again, and in perfect Joy, who have per-
 fectly embraced it; and those have al-
 ready received their *Judgment*, and are
 in *Hell*, who do resist it: Our Sins by this
 Doctrine are answered *within us*, and no
Righteousness that shall do us good is *with-
 out us* *.

FROM this long Collection of the Doc-
 trines of *H. N.* I doubt not but the B. of *L.*

* See *J. Kewstubb's Confutation of Monstrous Herasus of
 Henry Nicholas, &c. Lond. 1579. 4to.* who has made large
 Extracts out of *H. N.'s* Books, which I have transcribed
 even in their antiquated Style, since all the Originals them-
 selves are not easily to be procured; tho' some of them I
 have met with.

will be Justified to every impartial Reader that will compare them with the foregoing Testimonies of the *Leading Quakers*, when he asserted that the *Heads of the Quakers* had borrowed their *Mystical Scheme* from the *Heads of the Familists*. And if it be said that *G. Fox* and other *Quaker-Leaders* derived their Opinions from the *Ranters* (who were a little *intermediate*) rather than from the *Familists*; I answer, It amounts to the very same thing, since the *Ranters* held the same *Mystical Opinions* in many respects as the *Familists* did; of which I shall now only mention one remarkable Instance, namely, that of *Richard Coppin*, a *Ranter*, who (in his *Sermon at St. Giles's Cripplegate, Lond. 1654.*) calleth *Christ*, born of the *Virgin Mary* in the *Flesh*, a *Sign*; his being born *in us*, the *Substance*. [This occurs in the very *Title-Page*.] His Text is *Isaiab ix. 6. Unto us a Child is born*: Upon which he observes that "the *Prophet* speaks in the *Present Tense*," and thence concludes "the *Prophecy* was then fulfilled, that *Christ* was the Child then born, and in all Ages was, and is still to be, so born." He adds, "That *Christ*, born of the *Virgin Mary*, was but a *Sign* or *Shadow* of his being born in You in *Spirit* and *Glory*." And he proves this by *Isaiab vii. 14. The Lord himself shall give you a Sign, behold a Virgin shall conceive, &c.* [tho' a *Sign* here is not a *Type* or *Figure*, but a *Miracle*;

cle ; as frequently elsewhere in Scripture.] He applies here too *Jeremy xxxi. 22. A Woman shall compass a Man.* [See *W. Bayley* above.] Again, he calls Christ *born without the History*, and Christ *born within the Mystery*. [See *G. Whitehead* above about the *Blood of Christ*.] He farther says, “*Mary* “*is the Flesh, or Human Nature, and Jo-* “*seph is the Wisdom of this Flesh.*” And accordingly *Mary, Joseph, Jesus, and Herod, without*, are all but *Types and Signs of Mary, Joseph, Jesus, and Herod, within*. Again, says he, “*Then having seen and* “*known the Substance, you no more will* “*mind the Shadow.*” p. 7. *Ibid.*

IT were easy to add a larger *Extract* of several other *Ranters*, who sprang from the *Familists* as well as the *Quakers* ; but the single one now produced is sufficient to shew their good Agreement with the *Quakers*, and indeed their common Original. And therefore in Justification of the B. of *L.’s* Opinion of the Original of *Quakerism*, namely, that the *Mystical Scheme* of *G. Fox* and other Heads of the *Quakers* was borrowed from that of *H. Nicholas* the Head of the *Familists*, in Concurrence with that of the *Ranters*, I will subjoin to the *Extract* now made out of *H. N.’s* Books, in order to shew that the B. is not singular in his Opinion, a few Testimonies of some very knowing Persons in this Affair, who assert the very same thing.

THE

THE First is that of Dr. H. More, a Person not only very conversant in H. N.'s Writings, (as appears from his long * Con-^{* See Myss} futation of him) but that lived in the^{of Godli-} Time of the Rise of Quakerism, and wrote^{ness.} Lond. very soon after it appear'd in the World,^{1660.} viz. in 1660. He, in his † *Expostulation*^{P. 247—} 278. with the Quakers, and particularly about † P. 532. their Allegorical Mysteries and pretended^{§ 33.} *Inspirations*, speaks thus; " I dare appeal
" unto you whether you keep so precisely
" to the *Light within you*, but that you
" have consulted with that blind Guide
" H. Nicholas, and tasted of the treacher-
" ous Sops of his abhorred *Passover*; whose
" Fanatick Boldness has led the Dance to
" *this* mad Apostacy. Have you not cele-
" brated his detestable *Phase*, who has
" gone about to persuade the World, that
" the greatest and truest *Arcanum* of the
" *Lord's Supper* is *Judas-like* to betray
" their Master, to kill Christ *according to*
" *the Flesh*, that is, to lay aside and dis-
" believe *the Truth of his History*?" And
he adds several other Instances of their be-
ing inflamed and intoxicated by his Princi-
ples, which shall be here omitted.

The next Testimony is that of Mr. H. Hal-
ifax, who wrote a Treatise professedly on
this Subject with this Title, *Familism re-*
vived in the Quakers, in 8vo. And this
Charge of his has been much confirmed
by the very evasive *Answer* of W. Penn
to

to it; for tho' *all* the Parts of *Familism* may not possibly have been Revived in the *Quakers*, as *W. Penn* pretends; yet it is evident that the most distinguishing and *essential* Parts of it were the very same things in the *Quakers Allegorical* and *Mystical Scheme*, tho' possibly in Concurrence with, and by the Interposition of, the Scheme of the *Ranters*; which *very much* agreed with Original *Quakerism*, and indeed bore so near a Resemblance to it, that no Wonder the Books of the *Ranters*, wrote in the Times of Confusion, have been frequently mistaken for those of the *Quakers*.

See G.
Keith's
Third
Narrative,
p. 13, 14.

ANOTHER Testimony is that of *G. Keith*, a Person who must be allow'd to have been perfectly conversant in the Writings of *G. Fox*, of whom he speaks thus; "What-ever his Pretences were that he had his Doctrines from the *inward Teachings* of the Divine *Light* and *Spirit*, it is most probable he had most, if not all of them, from the Books of *H. Nicholas* and other *Familists*, and some *Ranters*; as *Gerard Winstanly*, *Richard Coppen*, and others, who had the like wild Notions before him, &c."

To these I would add the Testimony of the Author of the *Snake in the Grass*, if both my Adversaries did not labour under such inveterate Prejudices against him.

How-

-How

However, with other more candid Persons his *Authorities* will have some Weight. But to be as Compendious as may be with regard to so Disagreeable a Person as Mr. *Lesley*, I shall make no particular Extract of them, but content my self with Referring my Reader, in Proof that the *Heads* of the *Quakers* derived their *Mystical* Scheme from the *Heads* of the *Familists* and the *Ranters*, to that Author's *First* and *Second Defences* of his *Snake*, &c. as likewise in remitting our Letter-writer thither for a particular *Answer* to his Objection; (p. 5.) namely, that "G. Fox must be ignorant of any such Scheme, [*viz.* that of H. Nicholas] he being generally known to be unlearned and unacquainted with History." For (in 2d Defence p. 315.) Mr. L. states that very Difficulty, and resolves it by the Influence and Connexion of the *Familists* and the *Ranters*, and more particularly (p. 329.) by the History of *John Hincks*, a *Ranter*; with whom G. Fox kept Sheep for some time, and was made by his Fellow-Servant a *Ranter*; tho' that Title was afterwards exchanged into that of a *Quaker*, and given to his Followers from the Convulsions and Trembling Disorders they were under by Possessions, which seem to have been *Diabolical* in the

* See 1. Defence 1st part, p. 23, 24. and 2d part, p. 314, 15, 16, 17. &c. in C. about the Original of *Quakerism*.

well-known Cases of *Gilpin*, * *Toldervy*, and several others ; for which I refer to what has been Published relating to them.

HAVING thus Vindicated the B. of L. with regard to his asserting that the *Mystical Scheme* of the *Quakers* was, in the main Principles of it, originally derived from that of the *Familists*, tho' they might be immediately so from the *Ranters*, who very much agreed in the *same* Principles : I go on to explain the *Creed* of the *Quakers*, as compared with that of the *Familists* and *Ranters*, agreeably to the *Testimonies* of the Leading *Quakers* above ; or, in other Words I shall give their own Commentary on the *Apostles Creed*. Possibly indeed the *First Article* of it might be here omitted, viz.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.

BUT tho' the B. of L. has not charged the Leading *Quakers* with *Atheism*, (any more than their Body with *Deism*) yet it cannot be improper to observe even on this *First Article*, that some of them do not acknowledge *God the Father* in the *Christian* Sense of that Expression. For Instance, *W. Penn*, tho' he allows God to be the *Father* of the Universe, yet does he not acknowledge that "*Christ is properly the Son of God ;*" and therefore denies that God is *properly* his

* See *Toldervy's Foot out of the Snare*, Lond. 1656.

Father ; for which I Refer to the Testimony *above-cited*. And so in the other Part of this Article, *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, *G. Whitehead* denies that "*Christ* as the Son of God is *Co-creator with the Father* ; which he calls Nonsense and "unscriptural Language, and Blasphemy ;" and pretends that this implies *two Gods* : " for which I refer to his *Light and Life*, p. 24, 27.

--- *And in Jesus Christ* ---

It must be here Recollected that *W. Penn* and Others tell us, (with *N. H. the Familist*) that all the Transactions of an *outward Christ* are "but *facile Representations* " of what the *inward Christ* would do." And tho' *W. Penn* sometimes pretends to believe an *outward Christ*, yet he and *E. Burroughs* and others Declare they do not think such a *Belief* in him to be *necessary* to Salvation. They add, that the *Mystery* of an *inward Christ* is greater than that of the *outward*, which they depreciate as merely *Historical*. And therefore (besides their other Assertions) they must be presumed to believe principally in their *inward Christ*, or the *Light within*, which they have professed to be *sufficient without any thing else*, as *G. Whitehead* and others have expressly done.---*W. Penn* too makes *Christ* cease to be a *Person*, and to be only a *Quality*, in the very same manner as *H. N.* did before him. And

G. Fox asserts the *Second Birth* to be *Christ*, as H. N. pretended. For all which I refer to Testimonies *above*: And to those might be added, that G. Fox stiled himself *Christ*, as H. N. is known to have done.

---His only Son our Lord,---

THAT the *Spiritual Seed* was the *promised Seed*, W. Penn endeavours to prove; and thereby evacuates the *Literal Prophecy* relating to the *Messiah*; as H. N. has been shewn to do.---W. Bayley makes *Christ* the *inward Seed*, and to grow up *within* to be *Christ the Lord*; and not to be the *only Son*, because he is a *multiplied Son* in all Believers.---And G. Whitehead asserts, that *God-Man* as born of *Mary* is *Popish*.

---Who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,---

THIS is principally understood by the *Quakers* of *Spiritual Regeneration*, as a greater *Mystery* than the *Incarnation* of *Christ*; and by W. Bayley in particular, of *Christ's* being born in a *Virgin-Soul*, and as to be found *no where else*.---G. Fox says, that They have the *very Christ* of *God*, and yet that the *Flesh* of *Christ* was a *Figure*.---

---Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into Hell.---

THIS is explained by G. Fox, that *Christ* according to the *Flesh* was *crucified* in the *Days of Adam*, and that in *that Flesh* was the

the Reconciliation; [*viz.* in his *Heavenly Human Nature*];—by *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, that *Christ* suffers, is dead, and buried, *within* every Sinner, and that he *now* offers up himself a *Sacrifice* in every Believer: that the Atonement is *Spiritual*; and the *Blood* that cleanseth the Conscience from Sin is not that *outward* Blood which was shed at *Jerusalem*, and is perished, but the *Spiritual* and *Mystical* Blood that is shed *within*: that the *outward Crucifixion* of *Christ* will cease to be remember'd, when they see [or rather *feel*] his *inward* Crucifixion, is asserted by *G. Whitehead*; as it is by *S. Eccles*, that the *Blood* of *Christ* was no more than that of another Saint: and *W. Penn*, for many Pages together, (in his *Rejoynder against J. Faldo*) contends that *Christ* did not dye, nor hang on the Cross, but the *true Christ* was in that Man that did hang on the Cross and died; as likewise elsewhere, that we are not Justified by the *Blood* of *Christ*, either as he was *God*, or as *Man*, or as *God-Man*; and indeed that there was no Occasion for his making Satisfaction to the Divine Justice.

—*The Third Day he rose again from the Dead.*—

HE rose, but not with the *same Body* in which he was crucified and died, as being altered not merely in *Qualities* but in

Substance; say some of the Quakers, as *Penn* and *Whitehead*: Others say, he rose with a *Spiritual Body*, and they know not what became of his former *earthly* one. However, the *Spiritual Resurrection* of *Christ*, namely, that *within*, is agreed on by all of them to be the *principal Mystery*. And particularly *W. Shewen* says, that when they have arrived at Perfection, the Kingdom of *Christ* is surrender'd up to God the Father; which according to *St. Paul* is *consequential* of the *General Resurrection*: And it must be confessed that the Reality of this last has a strict *Connexion* with that of the *Resurrection* of *Christ*. Indeed they all agree in the *Moral Resurrection* of *Christ within*, (as the *Familists* did) tho' not in that of the *outward Christ* on the *Report* of *St. Paul*, or the *Testimonies* of Others; for they subvert the Faith of the *Resurrection* of *Christ without*, and therefore the *whole Christian Faith*, by giving him a new and quite different Body.

— *He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the Right Hand of God the Father Almighty.* —

THE *Literal Ascension* of *Christ* is allegorically perverted by *W. Shewen*; and it is said by *G. Whitehead*, that there is no Scripture-Proof of *Christ's* existing *outwardly* and *Bodily* without us, at God's Right

Right Hand; and accordingly he asks where is God's *Right Hand*? and what *Heaven* is it? And again, says he, I do not read that Christ is *in Heaven* with a *Body of Flesh, Blood, and Bones*; it was *Changed*. And indeed they generally understand this Matter, as *H. N.* did, in a *Spiritual* Sense, and as *within* them.

— *From thence he shall come to Judge the Quick and the Dead.*—

G. Fox says, He looked for Christ to come no other wise than *within* him. And *H. Norton* even Ridicules the *Second Coming* of Christ, and stiles him a *false Christ* whom other *Christians* expect, and are gazing after. *G. Whitehead* asks, Can it be reasonably thought to be a *Coming* that is not yet? — Is it now to be looked for *outwardly*? Dost thou look for Christ as the Son of *Mary* to appear *outwardly* in a *Bodily* Existence? &c. if thou dost, thou may'st look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him.

Draper or *Norton* says, The Eternal Judge is upon his Throne, and the Time of his *Judgment* is come, and the Hearts of all Men are made manifest before him.

— *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*—

Gawen Lawrie says, They have not only the *Operations* of the Holy Ghost, but the *Operator* himself in them: And likewise

G. Fox asserts, that they have the *same* degree of the *Spirit* that the *Prophets* and *Apostles* had : That what is spoke by the *Spirit* of Truth in any, is of as great, nay greater Authority than the *Scriptures*, is asserted by G. Whitehead : and that the *Inspiration* of the *Scriptures* can ever be proved by *Authorities* or *Tradition*, is denied by W. Penn ; as it is by G. Fox, that the Books of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*, are the *Gospel* : and indeed it is denied by all their Writers, that the *Scriptures* are the *Rule* of Faith and Manners.

— *The Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of Sins.* —

As to the *Catholick Church*, the *Quakers* in effect confine it to themselves ; and they do not rightly hold the *Communion of Saints*, as they have not the true Faith about the *Head* of those Saints as now *Residing* in *Heaven*, and indeed have no *Communion* with him as *God-Man*. And as to *Forgiveness of Sins*, G. Whitehead, W. Penn, and Others, deny *Justification* by the Blood of the *outward* Christ ; nor are they known to ask *Forgiveness of Sins* in their *Assemblies* for the Sake of the *outward* Christ, and that too on a vain Supposition of their own *Perfection*.

--- *The Resurrection of the Body.* ---

Nor the *Resurrection* of the *same* Body that died, but of the Body *substantially* changed ;

changed; say *G. Whitehead, W. Penn, R. Hubbertborn*, and others. And *W. Penn* in particular asserts, that what *St. Paul* says about the *Resurrection* is to be understood of the two *States* of Men in this World under the *First* and *Second Adam*, and does not relate to the *Resurrection* of carnal *Bodies*; namely, that the Sons of the *First Adam*, who are Men that are sown into the World *natural*, are raised *Spiritually* by the *Second Adam*, as the quickning *Spirit*; and the *earthly Body* is not spoke of *Adam*, but is *Earthly-mindedness*. And accordingly the *Kingdom of the Son* there spoke of is said by *W. Shewen* to be *already* surrender'd up to God the Father. And *R. Hubbertborn* condemns those that say that the Saints glorified in Heaven do yet hope for the *Resurrection of their Bodies*, and so not come to the End of their Hope. *G. Fox* says, that such [*viz. Hymeneus and Philetus*] overthrew People from the Faith that stands in Christ, who is the *Resurrection* and the Life; through which Faith they attained to the *Resurrection*, and had their vile Bodies changed, and made like unto his glorious Body. [instead of, *shall change, and shall attain.*]

1 Cor C.
15. v 44.
45. &c.

--- And the Life everlasting.---

THIS is so necessarily connected with the foregoing Articles, that the less needs to be said upon it. For if Christ's very Body

that died did not *rise*, neither shall our dead Bodies *rise again*; since, according to *St. Paul*, these infer one another, and must stand or fall together: And they that derogate from or deny these, (and who they are has been shewn *above*) by direct Consequence deny the *Everlasting Life* promised to good Christians as the Result of Christ's and their own *Resurrection*, in the same manner as *H. N.* did. In particular, *G. Fox* and *H. Norton* have been shewn in the Testimonies *above*, to derogate very much from the Belief of any outward *Heaven* and *Hell*, and consequently from all *Everlasting Life*, in the utmost Latitude of that Expression. And indeed by their Great Principle, namely, the *Sufficiency of the Light within without any thing else*, they have subverted at once, or at least render'd *unnecessary* to be believed, all the Articles of the *Apostles Creed*.

I HERE leave to every competent Reader a very easy Task, namely, that of Comparing the Principles of the Leading *Quakers* as expressed in the Testimonies *above*, which support this short Commentary of the *Quakers* on the *Apostles Creed*, with the foremention'd Commentary of *H. Nicholas* on the same *Creed*, by way of Illustration of the former; and I cannot doubt that it will be a very natural *Inference* from such a *Comparison*, that *G. Fox* and some of his principal Friends originally borrowed

rowed most of their wild Notions from that great Enthusiast *H. N.* For there is such a Coincidence of the one with the other, that no wonder the B. of L. with several other forementioned Writers, thought it very probable that the First and Leading *Quakers* borrowed their *Mystical* Scheme from the Head of the *Familists*: For tho' there was some Interval of Time between *H. Nicholas* and *G. Fox*, yet the Sect of the *Familists* was numerous in the younger Days of *G. Fox*, and when he began to form his Schism. And that the *Familists* were numerous at that Time appears from *E. Paggitt's Herefiography*, printed in 1645, that is, but a very little before the Origine of *Quakerism* under its Author *G. Fox*; in which Treatise is to be found a large Account of the *Familists* as then in Being, and whose Doctrines as there recited agree very much with those of the subsequent *Ranters* and *Quakers*. And to assist the Reader in forming such a Comparison, I cannot but observe to him the Harmony of *H. Nicholas* and *G. Fox* in a very Remarkable Instance; I mean, their rejecting the two Positive Institutions of our Lord, *Baptism* and the *Last Supper*, which they have equally *Allegorized away*, by making them merely *Spiritual* and *inward* Performances, in a manner peculiar to themselves.

HAVING

HAVING now shewn that the Principles of the Leading *Quakers*, as taken out of their own Writings, evacuate every Article of the *Apostle's Creed*; and that tho' they have subscribed that whole *Form of sound Words*, they meant nothing less than the *Catholick* Sense of it, according to their own express Acknowledgments; I think it superfluous to compare, in the same minute manner, the several Articles of their foremention'd *Parliamentary Creed* (in 1693,) with their avowed Doctrines, as laid down in the *Testimonies*, cited above out of their chief and earliest Writers. For if they have taken such unchristian Liberties with the common Standard of *Christians*, the *Apostles Creed*, as has been shewn; their Leaders may well be presumed to have used the same dishonest Arts in a *short Creed* of their own composition. For Instance; Why may they not be fairly supposed to have understood in it the Acts of a *Spiritual* Christ, or the *Light within*, when they seem to the *literal* Part of the World to speak of the Acts of an *outward* Christ? Or, if they speak of an *outward* Christ, are not those Acts reasonably to be referred to the *Heavenly* or *Spiritual* *Manhood* of Christ, (as asserted by *G. Fox*, &c.) rather than to his *Earthly* Human Nature? Or again, if they sincerely mean that they Believe that the *Outward* Christ did really per-

perform those Distinguishing Acts which they specify in the *First* and *Second* Articles of their forefaid *Publick Creed*, yet with what Modesty can they say that they *highly value* the *Sufferings, Death, &c.* of the *outward Christ for the Redemption of Mankind*, when (as it has been Authentically evinced) they throw so great Contempt on an *Outward Christ* and his *Sufferings, Death, &c.* as frequently to Declare the Belief of him and them not to be *Necessary* to Salvation, and that the *Christ within* them, their *Mystical Saviour*, is *sufficient to Salvation without any thing else?* And again, Who can doubt that when they profess in their *Second Article* to believe that *the very Christ of God was slain, dead, and is alive again, and lives for ever in his Divine Glory*, but that they mean that *very Christ of God* whom *G. Fox* asserted to be *within him*; since he might be so, and do all this, without ever having been *without him?* For, if for Instance, his *Blood shed within* is a proper Sacrifice, (as has been maintained) there is no occasion for that which was shed *without*, nor for supposing that it was so; and consequently the common Faith of the *Christian Church* is vain and unnecessary. And as for *Christ's living for ever in his Divine Glory*, why may not these Words be understood of such a *Spiritual* and merely *Divine Christ*, as *W. Penn*

Penn. and others of them have imagined to have dwelt indeed in a Human Body prepared for him, but in the same Sense as other Human Bodies are prepared for the *Light within* them; but not to have been so personally united to the Human Nature as to constitute *Christ* a *God-Man*; and if so, not to live for ever in his *Human Nature* as united to God, but merely as God in his Divine Glory. And indeed there is Reason to suspect an Artifice on this Occasion, since the *Quaker-Writers* generally form a wrong Notion of *Christ*, and Reason accordingly about him; namely, either as *God* distinctly, or as *Man* distinctly, and not as *God-Man*, that is, God and Man united inseparably in one Person. And to take Notice of this gross Mistake once for all, They must incur the manifest Absurdity of multiplying the Human Nature of *Christ* into an infinite Number of *Christs*, if *Christ*, properly so called, resides in every man; and therefore they choose to separate the Divinity from the Humanity in the *Christ within them*, tho' God and Man are inseparably *one Christ*. And once more; Who, after he has Read the forementioned Testimonies of *G. Fox*, *W. Penn*, *G. Whitehead*, (the last of whom assisted in Drawing up this very *Creed*) can prevail with himself to be persuaded that They sincerely believed the *Divine Authority of the Scriptures*, as
given

given by *Inspiration of God*, which they have again and again highly derogated from in their Writings; and indeed have denied it so far as to treat them with great Contempt, and even to Vilify them, in comparison of the *Light within* them? I shall therefore in order to avoid the tediousness of a Repetition, Refer on this occasion to the *Testimonies above*, and that indeed to the several *Classes* of them; I mean, with regard to the *greater* or *less* progress of their *Leaders*, there cited, in *Deism* and *Infidelity*. For some of them, it is evident, as they fall under the *First* Class, seem to deny the Truth of the *Facts* relating to an *outward* Christ: Others, that fall under the *Second* Class, deny the *Belief* of those *Facts* to be *Necessary* to Salvation: And again, Others, under the *Third* Class, *Allegorize* those *Facts* away: And Lastly, Others of them, under the *Fourth* Class, betray their Infidelity by detracting from the Authority of the Holy *Scriptures*, and treating them with an undisguised Contempt. And upon this Subject of a Reduction of the several *Quaker-Writers* to the several *Classes* of *Testimonies above*, I will only add in a cursory manner, that the other *Confessions* of Faith made by the several *Quakers* that are cited both by the *Letter-Writer* and the Author of *The Cloud &c.* are not only to be consider'd

sider'd as merely *Private*, but as made by Persons that are to be confronted with the *Testimonies* of Themselves and other Leaders of their Sect, as cited at least in the *Second Class* above, if not with some other *Testimonies* in different *Classes*.

HAVING thus shewn the Harmony between *H. Nicholas's* Principles, and those of the Leading *Quakers*, I now proceed to consider the good Agreement between the *Mystical* Scheme of the *Quakers* and that of *Mr. Woolston*, in various Respects. And this I think incumbent on me as I am professedly a *Vindicator* of the Assertions of the B. of L. whose Words, abstracting from the forementioned *Comparison* of *H. N.* and *G. Fox* are these; “The
 2 Vol. Pref. p. V. “Enthusiastical Pretensions---of *George Fox*
 “and other *Heads* of the *Quakers*----were
 “in many Respects the very same with those
 “that have been lately vamped up by *Mr.*
 “*Woolston*; namely, they *Allegorized a-*
 “*way the Letter* of the New Testament,
 “by opposing, or at least preferring, a *Spi-*
 “*ritual* or *inward Christ* to a *Literal*,
 “*Historical*, and *outward Jesus*; and that
 “in all the Circumstances of his Birth,
 “Life, Death, Resurrection, and Aseension;
 “about the *Letter* of which they
 “wrote with Contempt, tho' perhaps not
 p. VI. “so great as that of *Mr. W.*” The B. of
 L. adds; “I am far, however, from con-
 “demning

“ demning the *Quakers* as *Deists*; since
 “ many of that Sect have been, and no
 “ doubt now are, well-meaning tho’ igno-
 “ norant Persons, that have been imposed
 “ on by their Leaders; but I cannot ac-
 “ quit the *Founders* and *Heads* of that
 “ Sect from having been *Deists* in an *Al-*
 “ *legorical* Disguise.” The B. of *L.* ex-
 “ plains himself farther thus ---- “ He [Mr. p. VII.
 “ *W.*] has superadded a more Libertine
 “ and profane *Ridicule* of the most *Sacred*
 “ things, as likewise the Palliation of it
 “ by falsified or improper Quotations of
 “ the *Fathers*.”

AND in regard to Mr. *W.* He is intro-
 “ duced by the B. of *L.* as speaking thus, in
 “ the Body of his *Vindication*, out of that
 “ Author’s *Sixth Discourse*; “ That whereas
 “ the Bishop of *London* has collected many
 “ Sayings of *Jesus*, wherein he seems to
 “ Appeal to the Works he then did, and
 “ had done, in the *Flesh*, as to a witness
 “ of him;” Mr. *W.* asks, “ Why might
 “ not *Jesus* then *Prophecy*, and mean the
 “ *Spiritual* Works which *He-in-us* would
 “ do?” --- And he farther pretends “ That
 “ the Works he then did in the *Flesh* were
 “ but *Types* of the *Mysterious* Operations
 “ that would be the Demonstration of his
 “ Authority and *Messiahship*.” Mr. *W.* p. 52:
 “ goes on, and asks again, “ To what Mi-
 “ racles did *Jesus* truly and properly Ap-
 “ peal,

See Mr.
W.’s 6th
Disc. p.
 50, 51.
 See 2 Vol.
Vindic. p.
 570, &c.

Mr. *W.* p. 52:
ibid.

p. 572.
Ibid.

“ peal, in the Opinion of the *Fathers*, for
 “ his Authority and *Messiahship*? Was it
 “ to his *Typical*, or *Antitypical* Works?
 “ Was it to the Shadow, or the Substance
 “ of his Operations?” To these Questions of Mr. *W.* the B. of *L.* returned several
 Answers, which shall here be omitted, excepting the *Third*, which relates to the
Quakers; namely, “ That it is a gross Con-
 “ tradiction to assert that any Person who
 “ is properly stiled, *He-without-us*, can
 “ possibly mean the Person who is here
 “ stiled *He-within-us*. And indeed such a
 “ Confusion is so very Enthusiastical a
 “ thing, as to be capable of being defend-
 “ ed only on the Principles of the *Fami-*
 “ *lists* and *Quakers*, who have been deluded
 “ so far, as to lose the Belief of a real ex-
 “ ternal Jesus by the Christ within them,
 “ and the literal Resurrection of the for-
 “ mer by the *Spiritual* and *Moral* one of
 “ the latter; an Error, that is expressly
 “ condemned by St. Paul.” This is all
 that relates to the *Quakers* and Mr. *W.* as
 compared together in the B. of *L.*’s *Pre-*
face or *Vindication*; in the former of which
 consider’d as *Explanatory* of the latter (as
 has been already Observed in *this* Dis-
 course) two or three things are very obvi-
 ous. One is, that the B. of *L.* charged
 only the *Leading Quakers* with *Deism*, and
 that too under the candid Expression of,

“ *I cannot acquit them from that Charge;*”
 Another is, That he in Terms openly declares,
 “ He is far from condemning the *Quakers*
 “ (that is, the *Body* of them) as *Deists* ;” and
 that for the *Reason* there assigned : And a-
 gain, He has Distinguished between the
Quakers and Mr. *W.* as the latter more pro-
 fanely *Ridicules* the most *Sacred* things.

THE Reader will excuse this *Second* Re-
 petition of the B. of *L.*'s Words with re-
 gard to the *Leading Quakers* and Mr. *W.*
 since it was *necessary* to confront them with
 the Assertion of the *Letter-writer*, that the B.
 of *L.* had pretended that the *Mystical* See Lett.
p. 8.
 Scheme of the *Quakers* is the *same* with that
 of Mr. *W.* and accordingly he endeavours
 to shew from the Writings of the *Quakers*,
 that their Scheme [at large] is not the p. 18. 19.
Ibid.
same with Mr. *W.*'s : And again, since the
 same Author has thought fit to con-
 found the Case of the *Body* of the *Qua-*
kers with that of the *Leading Quakers*, be-
 tween which the B. of *L.* had so clearly Ibid.
 Distinguished : The unfairness of which
 Artifices cannot but be Censured by the im-
 partial Reader ; as likewise it must be left to
 him to determine, whether the B. of *L.* has
 made good his Charge upon the *Founders*
 and *Leaders* of that Sect in *this* Discourse.
 But in *Vindication* of the *Bishop*, notwith-
 standing so gross a *Misrepresentation* of his
 Words and Intentions by the *Letter-writer*,

K

(even

(even whilst he so warmly Complains of the B.'s *Misrepresentation* of the *Quakers*,) I shall now proceed to shew the Justness of the B.'s Observation ; namely, " That the " *Enthusiastical* Pretensions of *G. Fox*, and " other *Heads* of the *Quakers*, were in many *Respects* the very same with those " that have been lately *vamped up* by Mr. " *W.*" For indeed he has no where asserted that they are in *all respects* the very same. And what those many *Respects* were, I shall now evince by an enumeration of them ; and afterwards, in support of this Charge, I shall Cite, or at least Refer to, those Passages of the Writings of the Leading *Quakers* and of Mr. *Woolston*, in which they shew an unanimous *Agreement*, tho' it is not pretended an *universal* one.

First, SOME of the Leading *Quakers*, as well as Mr. *W.* seem to deny the *Facts* that relate to an *outward Christ*.

2. OTHER Leading *Quakers* express themselves with great *indifference*, as likewise sometimes does Mr. *W.* whether the *Facts* of an *outward Christ* were really performed or not ; and if they were performed, They with him deny the *Necessity* of the *Belief* of them.

3. As the *Quakers* in general assert, that those *outward Facts* were chiefly *Typical* of the Operations of *Christ within*, so does Mr. *W.* professedly.

4. As the *Quakers* infinitely prefer the *Spiritual* and *inward* Christ to the *outward* and *carnal* one ; so does Mr. *W.* every where, but more especially he insists upon that *Preference* in the *Conclusion* of his whole Argument on the Subject of *Jesus's Miracles*.

5. THE *Quakers* and Mr. *W.* agree not only in the Method of interpreting the Scriptures *Allegorically*, but in *allegorizing* away the distinguishing *Facts* of the *outward Christ*.

6. THE *Quakers* and Mr. *W.* more particularly agree in *allegorizing* away Christ's Positive Institution of the two *Sacraments*.

7. SOME of the *Quakers* and Mr. *W.* agree in denying any other *Heaven* and *Hell* than those *within Men*.

8. THE *Quakers* and Mr. *W.* agree in Depreciating, and Vilifying, the *Authority* of the *H. Scriptures*.

9. THE *Quakers* and Mr. *W.* agree in Railing at an *Hireling-Priesthood*, and the legal Maintenance of the *Clergy* by the Payment of *Tythes*.

I hope, if these several Heads shall be proved by proper Testimonies, out of the Writings of the Leading *Quakers* and Mr. *Woolston*, the Pretensions of them both will be consider'd as in many *Respects* the very same ; as likewise that such an *Agree-*

ment could not have been carried on by a mere *Coincidence*, but that Mr. *W.* designedly *vamped up* some of the *Quaker's* Principles, tho' he adapted them in a more profane manner to his peculiar *Burlesque* of Jesus's *Miracles*, and Supplementally added the pretended Authorities of the *Fathers* in their favour.

To carry on the proposed *Parallel*, in these *several Respects*, between the Leading *Quakers* and Mr. *Woolston*, I think it not improper to *Premise* some account of Mr. *W.'s* Sentiments in favour of the *Quakers*, as clearly expressed in his *two Letters* to Dr. *Bennet*, as likewise in his own *Answer* to them; in which the Great *Question* proposed is, "Whether the People called *Quakers*, do not the nearest, of any other Sect in Religion, resemble the *Primitive Christians* in Principles and Practice?" On which occasion he speaks thus; "I turned my Thoughts [after a pretended *Disappointment* in the Church of England]--among the *Dissenters*, and at last found that the *Quakers* alone bore Affinity to the *Primitive Christians*, as appeared upon Examination of their Books, in which you may discern real *Dawnings* of Evangelical Light and Truth, &c. ---- But alas! I found that the Rage and Fury of the *Clergy* against them was *general*; and how the Learned,

In 1720,
1721.

1st Lett.
p. 5, 6.

" as well as the ignorant, did pursue them
 " with Obloquies and Reproaches of *He-*
 " *resy* and *Infidelity*, &c." --- And again ^{p. 8.}
 says he, " I am to *vindicate* the *Quakers* a- ^{ibid.}
 " gainst the *Charge* and *Accusation* above :
 " [*viz.* that of their being *Heathens*] ---- I
 " taking upon my self the Person of a
 " *Quaker*, could not forbear *Challenging*
 " the ---- Authors of the *Delpbick Oracle* to
 " a *Disputation* on *this* Question," *viz.* that
 just now mentioned : [which *Challenge* was
 sent, accepted, and Answered, as Mr. *W.* in- ^{p. 9, &c.}
 forms us,] ---- And of the *Quakers* Mr. *W.* ^{ibid.}
 speaks thus ; ---- " In whom *true Christianity* ^{p. 16, 19.}
 " is reviving ; " ---- and he even pretends ^{ibid.}
 that they are " *The best Christians.*" Again
 he says, " *I purposely* publish this for the ^{p. 20.}
 " *Vindication* of the *Quakers* ; " as likewise, ^{ibid.}
 that " They do not only profess *Christi-* ^{p. 23.}
 " *anity*, but in *Defiance* of all their *Ad-* ^{ibid.}
 " *versaries*, will put in their Claim to the
 " *justest* and *best* Title to it. ---- I don't doubt
 " but ---- the *Apostles* and *Fathers* ---- will
 " universally and clearly give their Opini-
 " on and Judgment on their *side* : " Again,
 " They ought to be accounted *the best* ^{p. 27.}
 " *Christians.* ---- It shall [or rather *will*] be ^{ibid.}
 " easy to shew *their* [the *Quakers*] *Teach-* ^{p. 32.}
 " *ers* to be really wise and truly Learned ^{ibid.}
 " Men, excellent Philosophers, and singu-
 " lar Divines, in Comparison with the
 " most *literate* *Clergy*, &c. " ---- Again,
 " In

p 35.
Ibid.

"In plain Terms,----- Let me tell you,
"That *Primitive Christianity* is reviving
"in the *Quakers*; which I---will, under the
"assistance of God, contribute our utmost
"to the further growth and promotion of,
" &c." And once more; after an odd
2 Lett. piece of Facetiousness on the *Trade* of G.
p. 17. Fox, (too ludicrous to be here inserted) he
speaks thus, with a more serious Air; ----
"George Fox, their Great *Apostle*, was *Spi-*
"ritually an excellent *Workman*, and has
"shod the Feet of the Church, as these
"Times are called, with the *Preparation* of
"the *Gospel of Peace*." And likewise he
Sec Lett. speaks of ---- "The *Growth of Quakerism*,
p. 51. "as the Reviving of *Primitive Christianity*
Ibid. "by the *Means* of it."

FROM these several Quotations of Mr.
W's Letters it is most evident, that he
has not only entertained very favourable
Thoughts of the *Quakers*, and wrote a
Panegyrick upon them and their *Founder*,
but was actually their *Champion*, and pro-
fessedly *Defended* them against the Attacks
of the Authors of the *Delphick Oracle*;
and that he carried on the Dispute in so
Warm a manner, as to Confirm the Re-
port of Common Fame; namely, that he
himself formerly frequented the *Quaker-*
Meetings. And I cannot but Observe farther,
that both his *Letters* to Dr. Bennet were pub-
lished several Years before any of his *Dis-*
courses

courses on Jesus's Miracles. And how in those *Discourses*, as well as his two *Letters* and their *Answer*, Mr. *W.* Concurred in many *Respects* with the *Quakers*; I shall now lay before the Reader in a *Comparison* of them both together. And accordingly the following Extract of and Reference to both, shall be as methodically placed with regard to the foresaid Articles of *Agreement*, as is consistent with the Nature of the thing, tho' without an useless Repetition of those Articles in Form.

Mr. *Woolston*.

Many of the *Miracles* of *Jesus*, as recorded by the *Evangelists*, either in whole or in part were never wrought, but are only related as *Prophetical* and *Parabolical* Narratives, &c. See 2d *Proposition*, 1 *Dis.* p. 4.

The *History* of *Jesus's* Life, as recorded in the *Evangelists*, is an *Emblematical Representation* of his *Spiritual Life in the Soul* of Man; and his *Miracles* are *Figures* of his *Mysterious Operations*: The *Four Gospels* are

The *Quakers*.

To avoid an unnecessary Repetition, I here refer the Reader to the *First Class* of *Quaker-Testimonies* above; namely, those that are inconsistent with the Acknowledgment of an *Outward Christ*, and his Distinguishing *Facts*. [viz. from p. 12. to 20. in this Treatise.]

However, I cannot but particularly Observe upon this Subject of *Miracles*, that *W. Penn*, tho' he has not expressly denied the *Miracles* of *Jesus*, has, boldly

Mr. Woolston.

are in no Part a *Literal* Story, but a System of *Mystical* Philosophy or Theology. p. 64. *Ibid.*

St. *Austin* says of this Miracle, [*Jesus's Cure of the Issue of Blood*] that it was done as it is related ; and I have a greater veneration for *his* Authority than to gain-say it. 2 *Disc.* p. 9.

Whether there was any Truth at all in this Story [about the Woman of *Samaria*] I should much have questioned ; but that some *Fathers* write of it as if they believed it *Literally* : ---- And I having a sincere Veneration for the *Fathers* will not contradict them. 1 *Disc.* p. 48.

Jesus could not properly and ultimately Refer to those *Miracles* he then wrought in the *Flesh*, but to those *Mystical* ones which he would do in the *Spirit* ;

Quakers.

boldly insinuated " how *weak* an Argument " the Doctrine of *Miracles* is to prove the " *Verity* of the *Christian Faith*, or Doctrine " of *Revelation*, at this " time of Day, &c." *Serious Apol. in his Works*, 2 Vol. p. 38.

W. Penn lays it down as a general Key, that the *Outward Transactions* of *Christ* were " as so many *facile Representations* of what is to be accomplished in *Man*," Rep. to *J. Faldo*, p. 336.

Again, *W. P.* says, " They are an exact *Map* or *Picture* of " things, but not the things " themselves." *Works*, Vol. 2. p. 800.

As a *Specimen* of *Explanation*, *G. Fox* says ; " *Christ's Flesh* is a *Figure* ; " in *Saul's Errand* &c. p. 14. And *C. Atkinson* says, " Your " *Carnal Christ* is utterly " ly

Mr. W.

Spirit; of which those wrought in the *Flesh* are but mere *Types* and *Shadows*: viz. of what would be mysteriously and more wonderfully done by him. See 3d Prop. 1. Disc. p. 4. and 2. Prop. *ibid.*

—Of which *Mystical Resurrection* of our *Spiritual Jesus* [*i. e.* out of the Grave of the *Letter* of the Law and the *Prophets*] the *Evangelical Story* of the *Resurrection* of a carnal Christ is but mere *Type* and *Shadow*. 6. Disc. p. 2.

Jesus seems to appeal to the Works he then did, and had done in the *Flesh*, as to a Witness of him. But why might not *Jesus* then *Prophecy*, and mean the *Spiritual Works* which *He-in-us* would do? 6. Disc. p. 51.

Mr. W.'s *Second* and *Third Propositions* have been already cited, and they are so full and express

Quakers.

ly denied. See *Atkinson's Sword*, &c. p. 5. [Many other Passages of this kind shall be here Omitted: See them above in their *Class*.]

As to the *Quakers Indifference* whether the *Facts* of an outward Christ were really performed or not; and that if they were so, the *Belief* of them is not necessary; See the *Second Class* of *Testimonies* above, with regard to the *Sentiments* of *W. Penn*, *G. Whitehead*, and Others, [*viz.* from p. 20 to 38.]

However, I cannot but single out two or three pregnant *Testimonies*: *W. Smith* (p. 23. above) speaks of the *Facts* of *Christ*, with a general Slight, "as a Dispensation of God in Times past." *Gawen Lawrie* (p. 22. above) says, "It will avail nothing to know of Names and Things with-
out and abroad."

W. Penn

Mr. W.

press in asserting that the outward Facts of Christ were *Typical* of his Operations *within*, that I shall not here minutely transcribe what he professedly lays down, and attempts to prove in all his *Six Discourses*; but more especially in his *last* of all: Indeed he inculcates again and again to this Effect; viz.

Jesus's whole Life in the *Flesh* is but a Type, Figure, and Parable of his *Mysterious* and *Spiritual* Life and Operations in Mankind. 1 *Disc.* p. 50.

I am only for such a *Spiritual Messiah*, who will cure the Errors called the *Diseases* of Mankind, &c. 5. *Disc.* p. 53.

Jesus's first Coming in the *Flesh* was but Type and Shadow of his second Advent in the *Spirit*; and *Jesus* of old when he appeared to his Works then done,

Quakers.

W. Penn (p. 20. above) speaks thus; "Since then they [the Quakers] believe that *Appearance* [of Christ in the *Flesh*,] they therefore need not Preach what is not to be again, &c."--- *G. Whitehead* (p. 24. above) says; "The Quakers see no need of directing Men to the Type for the Anti-type, &c."

E. Burroughs, (p. 21. above) says: "The Doctrine of Salvation, which is only necessary, is to Preach Christ within, &c." [i. e. in Opposition to Christ without.]

Tho' *W. Penn* has been already observed to speak of the Outward Transactions of Christ "as so many facile Representations of what is to be accomplished in Man, and as so many outward Maps and Pictures of things within," yet he may

Mr. W.

Quakers.

done, as to a Witness of his Authority, did only *Prophecy*, and refer ultimately to his *Mystical Operations*. 6. *Disc.* p. 61.

— Supposing *Jesus* wrought *Literally* those *Miracles* which are *Allegorically* interpreted by me, I will in those very *Miracles* compare the *Literal* and *Spiritual Jesus* together; and appeal to all Men of Consideration, which is the most worthy of the *Title* and *Honour* of the *true Messiah*.---I am for the *Spiritual Jesus*, who, at his coming to the *Fig-Tree* of his Church, will make its present unfruitful State to *wither away*, and cause it to produce the *Fruits* of the *Spirit*, and *allegorical* Interpretations of the *Scriptures*, &c. 6. *Disc.* p. 55, 60, 61.

The *Scriptures* are to be interpreted in an *Al-*

legorical

may justly here be cited farther as converting the distinguishing *Facts* of an *outward* Christ into *mere Types* and *Figures* of an *inward* one: for he says, and that in the way of Complaint, That the *History* is made the greatest *Mystery*, and to believe the one matter of greater Difficulty than to experience the other: It is strange that should be reputed *most Myste-rious* which was the *Introduction* to the *Mystery*.---At this rate---Regeneration is a slight thing, in Comparison of the Knowledge of *Christ after the Flesh*. In *Rejoinder* to J. Faldo, as cited above, p. 38.

W. Shewen has been Cited above, as making the *History* of *Christ* not the *Mystery*, but an Introduction to and *Type* of it. p. 39, 40, 41.

W. Bayley likewise has been cited already to shew, that

Mr. W.

legorical Sense. 1. *Disc.* p. 7.

The *Spiritual Messiah* [whom Mr. W. Declares *he is for*] cures those Distempers of the Soul, that *Metaphorically* pass under the Names of *Blindness, Lameness, Deafness, &c.* 1. *Dis.* p. 17, 18.

Mr. W. answers the *First Objection* against the *Quakers*, viz. That they are *Allegorists* on the Scriptures, and turn the *History* of the Bible into an *Allegory*; says he, We *confess* the Charge, and plead in *our Defence* the Authority and Example of the *Primitive Fathers* of the Church, &c. 1. *Lett. to Dr. B.* p. 15.

I contend for the *Allegorical Interpretation* of the *Scriptures*, in *Defence of the Quakers* against your *Objection*, &c. 1. *Lett.* p. 37.

---The Fathers and the *Quakers* call the *Letter*---
Beastly

Quakers.

that he *prefers Christ's* being the *mighty God within* to his being so *without*, and that the latter is only *preparatory* to the former. And I Refer the Reader accordingly. p. 41, 42. above.

E. Burroughs stiles Christ God-Man *within us*; [See *Collect.* p. 138.] whereas W. Penn has been cited as denying that He is God-Man *without us*: and consequently, the *Mystery of Christ within* is consider'd by the *Leading Quakers* as greater than that of *Christ without*. p. 33. above.

W. Penn, G. Whitehead, and Others, have been already cited as asserting that the *Light within*, or the *inward Christ*, is *sufficient* to *Salvation without* any thing else: whereas they at the same time pretend, that the *Knowledge of*, and *Faith in*, the *outward Christ* is not *necessary*. See above. To

Mr. W.

Beastly Ware, &c. p. 47. *ibid.*

I rest in the *Ministry* of the *New Testament*, and not of the *Old*, that is, according to *Apostolical* and primitive Doctrine, as well as *Quakerism*, in the *Ministry* of the *Spirit* of the *Law*, and not of the *Letter* of it, &c. p. 63. *ibid.*

I will give the *Literal History* of *Christ's Resurrection*, that *sandy Foundation* of the Church, a Review, &c. 4. *Disc.* p. 68.

I am apt to believe, with the *Fathers*, that *Jesus* actually did *raise the Dead*; but --- these *Miracles* are only recorded for the sake of the *Mystery*. 5. *Disc.* p. 5.

I have carefully perused the *Fathers*, --- and can't find that they mean any more by *Christ's Second* or *Spiritual Advent*, than that clear Truth, right Reason

Quakers.

To which I shall here add what *F. Howgil* says, namely, while you have Hope in *any thing without* you, you stand in that which is *imperfect*. *F. H's Lament.* p. 19.

W. Penn says above; *Miracles* are Ceased only to them who have not *Faith*; and Many have and do know the Power of *taking up* their *sick Beds*, and *walking*: Their *Faith* in God's Power has made them *whole*. [that is, in the *Figurative Sense*.]

W. Shewen has been cited above, as *allegorizing* the whole *History* of *Christ*, even till his *surrendring up the Kingdom* to God, that is *within*, p. 39, 40, 41.

W. Bayley has likewise been cited above as not merely *Allegorizing*, but as *Allegorizing quite away* the *Birth* of *Christ*, and converting it into one *within* his People; where, he expresses

Mr. W.

Reason, and Divine Wisdom,—will descend upon the Church,—and enable her to bring forth the *Fruits of the Spirit*, &c. *3d Disc. p. 24.*

As to that *Literal* common Pulpit - Story (with all its *Appendages*) of Jesus's *Second Coming* on *Etherial Clouds*, as on a *Woolfack*, in his *Human*, tho' *Glorious* and *Majestick* Appearance, for the *Resurrection* of *Mens Bodies*, by *Sound of a Trumpet*, in the Audience of the *Dead*, &c. it is the most absurd, *Non-sensical*, and *Unphilosophical*,—groundless and worthless Stuff,----- that ever was told against Reason, against *Prophetick* and *Evangelical* Scripture, &c. *3d Disc. p. 25.*

Quakers.

expressly says, *Christ is only to be found.* p. 41, 42. above.

W. Penn allegorizes away the *Primitive Promise* of *bruising the Serpent's Head*; and he makes the *Seed* promised to *Abraham* inward and *Spiritual.* p. 44. above.

G. Whitehead makes the *Blood* of *Christ* shed on the *Cross* to be *perished*, and no *Justification* to be had by it; and therefore the *Blood* of *Christ* to be *Spiritual*, and shed *within.* *Light within,* p. 28, 29, 30, &c.

G. Whitehead even *Ridicules* the *Ascension* of *Christ* into *Heaven*, and his *Residence* above the *Clouds*, and converts them into correspondent *Transactions within.* *ibid. p. 54.* *G. W.* says; The *Body* of *Christ* in *Heaven* is not *carnal*, but *Spiritual.* --- I do not Read that he is in *Heaven* with a *Body* of

Quakers.

of Flesh, Blood, and Bones. *ibid.* p. 63.

As to the *Resurrection* of Christ, I refer to the *Testimonies* cited *above*, derogating from the *Identity* of Christ's Rising Body, and in favour of the *moral* Resurrection, or that *within*; and particularly to the Sentiments of *W. Penn*, with regard to the *Two States* mentioned by *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* xv. as having a necessary *Connexion* with the *Resurrection* of Christ. p. 53, 54, 56, 57. *above*.

E. Burroughs says; We witness Christ's *Resurrection*, not because *Paul* said so, but we have *seen* it. [*i. e.* They believe it only in the *Allegorical* Sense.] p. 55. *above*.

G. Whitehead even *Ridicules* the *Second Coming* of Christ; and he asserts that the *Body* of Christ in *Heaven* is not *carnal*, but *Spiritual*. p. 59. *above*. *H. Nor-*

Mr. W.

Quakers.

H. Norton denies that there is any other Coming of Christ, besides what is now in his Saints; and he says, The Eternal Judge is now on his Throne. p. 61. above.

G. Fox declared, that he looked for Christ to come no otherwise than within him. p. 60. above.

G. Whitehead says thus; Dost thou look for Christ as the Son of Mary to appear outwardly in a Bodily Existence, to save thee? &c.---If thou dost, thou mayst look till thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him. p. 17. above.

But besides this Objection against the *Quakers*, we will, if you give us Occasion for it, Answer your others against them; such as their Disuse of the two Sacraments, which I can easily account for, according to primitive

Dec-

G. Fox, as cited above, says; It is as unlawful to return to Baptism as to Circumcision; and he calls the Lord's Supper the Table of Devils, and Cup of Devils. p. 66. above.

James Naylor has been cited above about the

Mr. W.

Doctrine; and shew that your *Continuance* of them is no other than an *Enchantment*, and *Hocus-Pocus-Trick* to delude the Ignorant, and keep up in the Minds of the People a Veneration of your *Priestly Office* and Power.
1. Lett. p. 32.

Quakers.

the *Spiritual Eating* and *Drinking in Remembrance* of *Christ*; that is, *not* eating and drinking at all the *Bread* and *Wine* set apart in Commemoration of the Death of *Christ*; but eating and drinking at *Common Meals in his Fear*, and therefore *in Remembrance of him*, and so *shewing the Lord's Death till he come Spiritually*, or *within* them. But Quotations on this Occasion are superfluous, since the Use of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, otherwise than as *Spiritualized* and performed *within*, is universally acknowledged to be abolished by the *Quakers*; as is evident from their numerous Books on that Subject, particularly that by *T. Lawson*, in which their Sacrilegious Annuling of them in the *literal* Sense is openly Defended. p. 66. above.

L

G. Fox

Mr. W.

— After-Ages have departed from the true and original Doctrine of *Devils*, making a *literal* Story of that which is only *mystical* and *cabalistical*.---*Hell* is the bewilder'd State of *Christ's* Church.--- The *Fathers* had a *cabalistical* Notion of *Hell*.--- Human *Vices* are *Devils*.--- *Satan* is no other than an Averseness in Man to the Will of God. 2. *Disc.* p. 41, 42, 43.

I know of a Certainty there is a *Hell*, a *State*, *τὴν ἀδύ*, into which all the People were turned that forgot God their Saviour; and when the *Visions* of that State shall be opened, we shall Behold who are the *Black Guards* of it, that have taken away the Key of Knowledge, &c. 1. *Lett.* p. 50, 51.

The Four *Gospels* are in no part a *Literal* Story, &c. 1. *Disc.* p. 64.

Many

Quakers.

G. Fox says there's none have Glory and a *Heaven* but *within them*, &c. — And again; To witness *Heaven and Hell within* and the *Resurrection*, [*i. e. within*] is not the *Mystery of Iniquity*, — it being what the *Scriptures* bear witness to. p. 64. and p. 65. above.

H. Norton says; I know and believe that there is *no other* Heavens than that the Saints are in, — and can partake of *no other* Glory than what they now enjoy. p. 64. above.

W. Penn asserts, that the *Scriptures* are not the *Rule* of Faith and Manners, and that they are *imperfect*, and *uncertain*, and were not rightly collected by *Tradition*, and that their *Inspiration* can never be proved by *Authorities*.--- And that the *History* cannot be the *Rule* leading into the *Mystery*:

Mr. W.

Quakers.

Many of the *Miracles* of *Jesus*, as recorded by the Evangelists, in whole or in part were never wrought. p. 4. *ibid.* &c.

I don't believe it [the Miracle of the *Fig tree*] was at all done by him according to the *Letter*. 3. *Disc.* p. 10.

Jesus was certainly the absolute, and most consummate Perfection of a Cabalist, *Mystic*, Parabolist, and Enigmatist. 3. *Disc.* p. 65.

So absurd is the Letter of this Story, [*viz.* of the *Paralytick* let down thro' the Top of the House] that for the Honour of *Jesus*, and Credibility of his *Gospel*, it is absolutely necessary to turn it into *Allegory*. 4. *Disc.* p. 63.

—If we don't at this Day make *Mystical* Operations of them [*Jesus's Miracles*] they will none

stery: And both He and R. Barclay deny the Scriptures to be necessary. p. 68, &c. above. p. 79 above. p. 71, 72. above.

G. Fox denies the Books of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*, to be the *Gospel*; and he says, The Scriptures are *Death*, *Dust*, and *Beastly Ware*, — and *Serpent's Meat*, &c. p. 77, 78, above.

S. Fisher says, the Scriptures are a rotten Foundation. p. 78. above.

G. Fox and R. Hubbertorn say, The Scriptures are but a *Killing Letter*. p. 78. above.

W. Dewsbury stiles the *Gospel* a *Dead Letter*, which had deceived him. p. 79, above.

G. Whitehead calls the Scriptures a *Sealed Book*; *ibid.* [With many more Testimonies, from p. 68. to 80. above.]

Mr. *W.*
of them, according to the
Letter, stand their Ground,
&c. 4. *Disc.* p. 69.

Mr. *W.* asserts, that the
Lives of the *Philosophers*
were wrote better by *Dio-*
genes Laertius than the
Life of *Christ* by the *Apo-*
stles; and he labours to
render doubtful the Cir-
cumstances of *Christ's*
Resurrection, and the Tes-
timonies that prove it as
recorded in the *Gospels*.
And in many Places He
talks much of the *Mysti-*
cal Resurrection, the *Per-*
fection of Time, and the
Great Sabbath, &c. of
which *Christ's Miracles*
were only *Types*; but I
omit these Particulars,
since the Testimonies a-
bove are sufficient. See
Disc. 3. p. 28. and *Disc.* 6.
passim.

I believe — that the
Ministry of the Letter and
the *Hireling - Priesthood*
have been the Cause of
the *Infidelity* and *Apostasy*
of these latter Times.

— I

Quakers.

Your Original is *Carnal*, *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and
Latin, and your Word

is *Carnal*, the *Letter*.

Whether the First *Pen-*
man of the *Scriptures*
was *Moses* or *Hermes*?

Or whether both these
are not One? Or whe-

ther there are not many
Words contained in the

Scriptures which were
not spoken by the *Inspi-*

ration of the *Holy Spi-*
rit? &c. [See more

sceptical Doubts of the *Sa-*
cred Writers in *W. Penn's*

Christian Quaker.] See
G. Fox's News out of the

North, p. 14. See *J.*
Whitehead's Quaker's Re-

fuge, p. 17. The *Priests* of the

World are *Conjurers*,
raising *Dead Doctrines*

out of the *Letter*, which
is *Death*; *Thieves*, and

Robbers, *Anti-christs*,
Witches, *Devils*, *Lyars*,

a *Viperous* and *Serpentine*
Generation, *Blas-*

phemers,

Mr. W.

— I believe — that the Spirit and Power of *Jesus* will soon enter the Church, and expel *Hireling-Priests* who make *Merchandise* of the *Gospel*, out of her. ---- I Believe that the *Ministry* of the *Letter* of the Old and New Testament is downright *Antichristianism*. 5th Disc. p. 69.

---- I am delightfully ravished and transported with the Forethought and Happiness of Mankind, upon the extinction of *Ecclesiastical Vermin* out of *God's House*; when the World will return to its primigenial and Paradisiacal State of Nature and Religion, and Liberty; in which we shall be all taught of God, and have no need of a foolish and contentious Priest; &c. 5th Disc. p. 71.

To prepare Mens Souls for the susception of such a *Spiritual Jesus*, I intend to publish a Discourse

Quakers.

phemers, &c. They sell the *Report* of Others, the *Letter*, which is *Dust* and *Death*, &c. See brief *Discovery* of the *Three-fold Estate* of *Antichrist*, signed by G. Fox, T. Lawson, &c. p. 7, 8, &c.

The idle *Gormandizing Priests* of *England* run away with One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Pounds a Year, under pretence of *God's Ministers*, — no sort of People have been so universally, through Ages, the very *Bane* of the Universe as that abominable Tribe, [of *Priests*] for whom the Theatre of *God's* most dreadful Vengeance is reserved to add their *Eternal Tragedy* upon. *W. Penn* in his *Guide* mistaken, p. 18. in 1668.

If the *Quakers* Expressions had been ten Thousand times more significant, earnest, and sharp against

Mr. W.

course of the *Mischiefs* and *Inconveniences* of an *Hireling-Priesthood*, wherein it shall be proved, that Mankind cannot be either good, wise, or happy, under the Kingdom of *this Messiah to come*, without an *abolition* and *extirpation* of them. *6th Disc. p. 56.*

Your *Objection* also against the *Quakers* for their ill Treatment, as you think it, of the *Clergy*; calling them *blind Guides*, *Baal's Priests*, *Merchants of Babylon*, and the like, shall be handled; on which you shall see, what Testimonies out of the *Fathers* can be produced to *justify them* in the use of such Language towards you; for we are minded ---- to *publish* so much from the Writings of the *Primitive Church in Defence* of the *Quakers*, as shall effectually stop the Mouths of all *Gain-sayers*,

Quakers.

against that cursed bitter Stock of *Hirelings*, they had been but enough: — and We have nothing for them [the *Clergy*] but *Woes* and *Plagues*, who have made drunk the Nations, and laid them to sleep on downy Beds of soft self-pleasing Principles; whilst they have cut their Purses, and pickt their Pockets. *Tophet's* prepared for them to act their eternal Tragedy upon, whose Scenes will be renewed, direful, anguishing *Woes* of an eternal irreconcilable Justice. *W. Penn* in *serious Apol. p. 156.* in 1671.

Let all *Glebe-Lands*, that's given to the *Priests*, be given to the *Poor*. *G. Fox* to the *Parliament of the Common-Wealth of England, &c. p. 8.*

Sell all the Glebe-Lands, &c. — for we
Declare

Mr. W.

ers, &c. ---- You are too much in Love with the *Mammon* of this World to desert the *Ministry* of the *Letter*, and Service of *Baal*, for the Worship of the Living and True God ; &c. *1st Lett. to Dr. B. p. 33.* ---- *Ecclesiasticks* in all Ages, have been the *Bane* of *Society*, and the *Pest* of *Mankind* ; &c. [*6th Disc. p. 64.*]

There is another thing yet *peculiar* to the *Quakers*, beyond any other Sect of Religion whatsoever, and that is their Enmity to *Tythes* and a *mercenary Priesthood* : If upon this Score they are deserving the Name of *Heathens*, then I will allow that That of the *worst* is too good for them. [On which occasion Mr. W. goes on to defend them.] *1st Lett. p. 25, &c.*

Quakers.

Declare with our Hands, and with our Lives and Estates, against the *Ministry* that take *Tythes*, and the Setters of them up, and the First Authors of them, and the *Laws* that upholds them, &c. See several Papers sent to the Parliament in 1659, (subscribed by above 7000 *Quakers*.)

The *Quakers* in their yearly *Epistle*, in 1693, ordered, That all due and godly Care be taken against the grand Oppression, and *Antichristian* Yoke of *Tythes*, that our Christian *Testimony* born, and greatly suffered for, be faithfully maintained against them in all *Respects*, &c.

Slay *Baal*, *Balaam* must be slain ; all the *Hirelings* must be turned out of the Kingdom, who pretend that God sent them. G. Fox in *News out of the North*, p. 31. 1655.

I

L 4

An

Mr. W.

I hear ---that you have an Inclination to give the Words of the *Prophet* about *robbing God in Tythes and Offerings*--- a quite different Turn, and to shew that the Priests, or *Ministers of the Letter*, are the *Robbers of God and his People*, by exacting *Tythes and Offerings* of them for their Ministry, &c. Mr. W.'s own Answer to his 2d Lett. to Dr. B. p. 29.

Ministers of the Letter are Worshippers of the *Apocalyptical Beast*. Disc. 6. p. 66.

The *Clergy* are stiled, The Whore of *Babylon's* Chaplains. 1st Lett. to Dr. B. p. 62.

If we made a Push for an *Act of Parliament* to turn the *Clergy* to Grass, after K. *Henry VIIIth's* Monks and Fryars; where would be the Harm of it? Nay, the Advantage

Quakers.

An ill-bred, Pedantick Crew, the *Bane* of Religion and *Pest* of the World; the Old Incendiaries to Mischief, and the best to be spared of Mankind; against whom the Boyling Vengeance of an irritated God is ready to be poured out. W Penn in his *Quakerism a Nick-Name*, &c. p. 165. [viz. about the *Dissenters*.]

That *Anti-Christian* Apostatized Generation, the *National Ministry*, have received a Deadly Blow by our Witness against their forced Maintenance and *Tythes*; — so that their Kingdom, in the Hearts of Thousands, begins to Totter, and shall assuredly fall to the ground. Rob. Barclay's *Anarchy*, p. 41. in 1671.

You bestow them [i. e. outward Creatures] upon *Baal's Priests*; the Lord may justly require the

Mr. W.

to the Publick, as well as to Religion, would be great, if *their Revenues* were applied to the *Payment of National Debts*; &c. *Disc. 4. p. 7, 8, 9.* [viz. in *Ep. Dedicat.*] [But it would be endless to Transcribe Mr. W.'s not merely *Allegorical*, but *Literal*, *Invectives* against the just and legal Maintenance of the *Clergy*, throughout all his *Six Discourses*, as well as his other Writings.]

Quakers.

the *Outward* things from you again. — So all the *Preachers for Tythes and Money*, and the *Takers and Payers of Tythes*, must be *Testified* against in the *Lord's Power and Spirit*: — And therefore, *in the Power of the Lord*, maintain the *War* against the *Beasts*; — Keep your *Authority and Dominion*. *G. Fox's Journal*, p. 431. [viz. wrote in 1677. Published in 1694.]

They who pay *Tythes* — thereby deny *Christ* to be come in the *Flesh*, which is a *Mark of Antichrist*. *Tho. Ellwood* in his *Antidote &c.* against *W. Rogers*, p. 78.

Our *Principles* are now no other than what they were when we were *first* a *People*; for *Truth* changes not. *Jos. Wyeth* in *Primitive Christianity*, p. 8. in 1698.

The *Account of Friends* Suffer-

Mr. W.

Quakers.

Sufferings in *England* and *Wales*, brought in *this Year*, which are, as usual, mostly for *Tythes* and *Church Rates* so called, is *Three Thousand Three Hundred and Five Pounds* and upwards; and there is one *Friend* a *Prisoner* on that *Account*. — And Dear *Friends*, an earnest *Tra-vail* and *Concern* of *Mind* remains upon the *Spirits* of many *Brethren*, in order to excite all *Friends* who make *Pro-fession* of *Truth* with us, to stand *Faithful* in that *our Ancient and Christi-an Testimony* against *Tythes* of all kinds, (as well as *Church Rates* so called) according to the several former *Advices* of this *Meeting*, particularly that in the *Year 1706. Yearly Epistle* in 1731. p. 2, 3.

HAVING thus drawn a *Parallel* between the *Principles* of the *Leading Qua-kers*

kers and those of Mr. Woolston, (to which
 a great variety of other Passages of both, ve-
 ry nearly resembling one another, might
 be easily added) I hope the B. of L. is suf-
 ficiently Vindicated from the Imputation
 of having Misrepresented the Scheme of the
Leading Quakers, namely, as having a great
 Co-incidence, or being the *very same*, with
 those that have been lately *vamp'd up* by
 Mr. W. and that in those *many Respects*
 which have been now enumerated ; and
 more especially as they have concurr'd in
Allegorizing away the Letter of the New
 Testament, by *opposing*, or at least *prefer-*
ring, a *Spiritual* and *inward Christ* to a Li-
 teral, Historical, and *outward Jesus*, and
 that in all the distinguishing *Circumstances*
 of him. For tho' it has not been pretend-
 ed by the B. of L. that the *Leading Qua-*
kers have directly denied the Truth of the
 particular *Miracles* of *Jesus* in as great a
 Latitude as Mr. W. has done, and much
 less with his Virulence, and the same De-
 gree of a Profane Contempt of them as
 they are *Facts* ; yet it must be confess'd,
 from a due Comparison of them, that they
 have Agreed in the same general grounds
 of *Allegorizing them*, and all the other
 peculiar *Facts* of the *Outward Christ*,
 into *Spiritual* Operations of the *Christ*
within ; and therefore Consequentially, and
 to all *effects* and purposes, the *Leading*
Quakers have *lost the Belief*, or at least the
necessity

See 6th
Disc. p. 50,
51, &c.

See 1st
Lett. to
Dr. B. p.
17.

necessity of the *Belief*, of a real external *Jesus* by the *Christ within* them. And indeed Mr. *W.* has not only Revived the *Quaker-Principle* of preferring an inward *Christ* to an outward *Jesus*, when he was incapable of directly opposing farther that outward *Jesus*, in the very same manner as the Leading *Quakers* have done; but He with them too has used the very same Language about the *Spiritual Works* which *He-in-us*, or the inward *Christ*, would do; as likewise Elsewhere he has asserted that those Persons who opposed the *Quakers* were not only *Heathens*, in whom *Christ* is not, but (by a gross Abuse of *St. Paul*) were mere *Reprobates*.

THE B. of L. indeed is so far from Charging the *Quakers* with having embraced the profane Principles of Mr. *W.* with regard to the *Miracles* of *Jesus*, that what he has said no more than that Mr. *W.* has vamp'd up some of their *Enthusiastical Pretensions* in support of his own impious Scheme. But that the *Quakers* have fall'n into the *Impieties* of his Scheme, the B. has no where affirmed. That part of his Scheme in which he pretends that *Jesus* Prophefied in his *Miracles*, and meant what *He-in-us* would do in a *mystical* manner, is certainly downright *Quakerism*, as the B. has asserted; as likewise it is, that the Operations of the *Spiritual* or *inward* *Christ* are

are vastly more miraculous than those of the outward one. The B. indeed made a Supposition, or seeming Concession, in his *Vindication of Jesus's Miracles*, which is cited by the Author of *the Cloud*, &c. viz. That tho' Christ's *Spiritual Operations*, in pardoning Sins and reforming Immoralities, were allowed to be greater than his outward Miracles that relate to the *Body*, yet this Concession would not prove that he did no *Miracles* relating to the *Body*. This Concession, I say, does the Quakers no Service at all, on Supposition they acknowledge the *Miracles* of Christ, as they pretend to do. But if they deny, or derogate from, the Truth of those *Faets*, they confess a direct *Coincidence* with Mr. W. and fall under the same *Censure* with him. However, it does not follow either way, that there can be any Imputation on *Jesus's outward Miracles*, which are inflexibly the very same *Faets*, whether they are greater or less than *Jesus's inward Miracles*, and are no way affected by a Comparison with them. I will add, that I am so well acquainted with the B. of L's Sentiments that I can Answer for him, that he is far from imputing the impious Part of Mr. W.'s Scheme to the Quakers, and adding their *Body* to his Party; (as the *Letter-writer* Let. p. 26. vainly suggests) which he has been so far from doing, that I doubt not he rejoices

joices that they have openly Declared against him in their *General Epistle* last Year, and their late *York-Letter*; in which they professedly vindicate themselves from favouring Mr. *W.*'s Blasphemous *Burlesque* of *Christianity*. And tho' the B. has asserted that the *Mystical* Schemes of them and Mr. *W.* agree in *many respects*, (some of which have been now specified) yet he has no where said that they agree in *all Respects*. And indeed I question not but that he charitably hopes that the *Quakers* have not been thoroughly sensible of the *Consequences* of their own Opinions, as having a Co-incidence in *several Respects* with those of Mr. *W.* and that when they shall see them, they will abhor and renounce them, as having so much Impiety grafted on them by Mr. *W.* And this may be farther illustrated by Recollecting, that as the Body of the Common People in the Christian Church during the *Fourth* Century continued Orthodox, whilst too many of their Superiours were infected with *Arianism*, according to the Observation of some of the *Fathers*; so the Body of the *Quakers* has been expressly exempted by the B. from the Charge of *Deism*, from which their *Leaders* have not been acquitted. However, the B. has no where Charged any of the *Quakers* with having been tainted with the whole wicked Scheme of Mr. *W.* or with
being

being his Disciples, tho' he has borrowed several of their *Mystical Doctrines*, and built his own Impieties upon them : which Superstructure I am very glad to hear they in plain Terms disown, and warn their People against, as *vile and licentious*. And I hope those Warnings will have that Effect as to hinder hereafter some Persons of Figure in their Sect from frequenting the well-known *Club of Deists* ; who, as they have appeared among us in the different Shapes of *Socinians, Arians, &c.* may possibly act so Artful a Part at this Time as to play *Quakerism* against *Christianity*. But whether our *Letter-writer* is one of those that favour the Cause of *Deism*, tho' under the *Mask* of a *Quaker*, must be left to Time to discover.

BUT since the *Letter-writer* has quoted See *Let.* p. 15, 16, 17. some *Texts* of *Scripture*, as Authorities for the *Quaker-Doctrine* of *Christ within* ; Authorities, no less considerable than those of *St. Paul*, and of *Jesus Christ* himself ; the *literal* Sense of which *Texts* he pretends may be equally *Allegorized* away with the Declarations of the *Quakers* ; I shall now shew the Weakness of that Pretence, by setting those *Texts* in a true Light, and that, in a short Commentary on them.

THE First *Text* the Author of the *Let.* Let. p. 15. produces is, 2 Cor. xiii. 5. *Examine yourselves; Know you not your own selves, how*
galed *that*

that *Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be Reprobates?* This is to be interpreted by the *Occasion* and the *Context*. The *Occasion* is express'd not only throughout this whole *Epistle*, but in the *third Verse* of this *Chapter*; viz. the *Power* given by *Christ* to *St. Paul*, to chastise Offenders; in which *Verse* too the same Words, ἐν ὑμῖν, are used most evidently for, *among you*, and not properly for, *in* or *within* you; for he speaks immediately before thus, (viz. in the 2d V. of this C.) *I have told you before*, (1 Cor. C. 4. v. 21.) — *and I now write to them that heretofore have sinned*, [and have not repented, C. xii. v. 21.] *and to all others* [i. e. in the like Case] *that if I come again, I will not spare you*. He goes on in the next *Verse*; *Since ye seek a Proof of Christ speaking in me, who is not weak towards you, but is mighty in you*: this must be understood, *among you*, because they whom he spoke of were great Offenders, in whom *Christ* could not be said to be *mighty*, unless in the *Power* of Chastising them that was exerted by *St. Paul*; viz. on the incestuous Person, and those who profaned the *Lord's Supper*. Which he confirms by a *Comparison* of the Appearance of *Weakness* in *Christ's* Sufferings and Death, but his real *Power*, with his own Appearance of *Weakness*, but real *Power* shew'd to them in those Instances: Whence he goes on to the

1 Cor. v.

4. 5. &c.

1 Cor. xi.

20, 21, &c.

2 Cor. xiii.

4.

the 5th V. and says, as a farther Proof of the Power of Christ shew'd to them, *Examine your selves, whether ye be in the Faith; prove your own selves: Know ye not your own selves, (i. e. by the Miracles done among you, and the various Gifts conferr'd upon you) how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be Reprobates?* That is, that *Jesus Christ* is among you, unless you are so far rejected of God that he has withdrawn those Gifts from you. Where the Preposition, *ἐν*, must unavoidably signify, (as it frequently does elsewhere) *among*, and not, *within* you, as it did in the foregoing Verse now recited; if they are the same Offenders that are here spoke of as were just before, in whom *Christ* cannot be supposed to have dwelt. Or if the Apostle be supposed to speak of Others among them, who doubted of the Power of *Christ* as shewn by the Apostle, he refers them very justly to the Miracles wrought by him among them, and the Gifts they received by his Preaching among them; which were such outward Testimonies of the Power of *Christ* among them, as *Christ* merely within them could not evince to Other Persons who doubted of that Power. The Phrase here used alludes to that of the doubting Israelites after *Moses's* Miracles; namely, *ἐν κυρίῳ ἐν ἡμῖν*, is the Lord among us? *Exod. xvii.*

M

where

where the Sense is not, *within us*, (which would be absurd) but indeed, *without us*, *with us*, or *among us*. So here from the *Miracles* and *Gifts* among the *Corinthians*, Christ was proved to be *among* them, though not *in* them; to be *Miraculously* present *with* them; who are here spoke of in *general* as the Church of *Corinth*, and not as *Private* Persons. So that on either of these Suppositions it would be absurd to interpret the Preposition, *in*, by the Word, *in*; and the Sense plainly requires that it be render'd *among*, or *with*, you. And consequently, the *Quaker* - Interpretation of this Text assigned by the *Letter - Writer* is false; that is, the Doctrine of *Christ within* cannot be at all Justified by it, since it relates to Christ *without* them. And as to any Pretence that the Preposition, *in*, necessarily signifies *in*, whoever consults his Concordance, will find that it frequently signifies *with*, and *among*, in Holy Scripture. And I cannot but here Observe, that as the *Quakers* have converted at Pleasure, in a sort of solemn Playing with the mere *Sounds* of Words, *Figures* into *Realities*, and *Realities* into *Figures*; so upon the same precarious Bottom, they might as well interpret the Scripture *Figures* of *our* being *in Christ*, and *putting on Christ*, and

See Lett.
P. 15.

self,
" w
Gene
thus
" rin
" at
" the
" son
" are
" the

and the like, as that of *Christ's being in Us*, in the *Literal* and proper Sense of those Expressions. And therefore I shall intimate farther here, that * instead of *Railing* at Learning, and making the *Light within* an *Asylum* of *Darkness* and Ignorance, they ought to Cultivate *Sacred Criticism* a little more than they have usually done, not only with the Help of the *Spirit*, but of some skilful *Commentators*, and by comparing Scriptures with *parallel* Scriptures and their *Scope* and *Occasion*, as well as with the General Sense of the *Primitive Church*, in order to distinguish *Figurative* Expressions from *proper* Phrases and Realities. And I take Notice of this the more particularly, because it is plain they have turned the *Two Sacraments* into *Figures*, for want of a little *Critical* Knowledge; and, how *Mystical* soever they may be on other Occasions, they have too strictly and *literally* interpreted the Passages of Scripture relating to *Oaths*, as well as made *Tythes* merely *Levitical*.

See Cloud
&c. p. 33.

M 2

AND

* G. Fox (in *Introd. to his Battle-dore*) says of himself, "All Languages are to me no more than *Dust*, who was before Languages were." And he (in his *General Epistle to Friends*, p. 10. Lond. 1667) speaks thus: "The *Priest* saith, that *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, were the *Original*; the many Languages began at *Babel*, &c. — All the *Priests* that have gotten the many Languages, which began at *Babel*, they tell some ignorant People that they have the *Original*, and are the *Orthodox* Men, and get in a different *Habit* from them, and say the *Quakers* are a *Simple* People, and de-

" *spise*

See Lett.
P. 15.

ANOTHER Passage of Scripture cited by the Letter-writer in Proof of the Doctrine of Christ within, is Coloss. i. 27. *To whom God would make known what is the Riches of the Glory of this Mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the Hope of Glory.* Now the Meaning of this is best explained by the immediately preceding Verse; viz. *Even the Mystery which has been hid from Ages and Generations, but now is made manifest to the Saints; that is, the Calling of the Gentiles to the Christian Faith, and the incorporating them, together with the Jews, in the Church of Christ.* He goes on thus; *To whom God would make known what is the Riches of the Glory of this Mystery among the Gen-*

See Ephes.
iii. 3, &c.

“ *spise the learned orthodox Men who have the Original.* —
 “ *The Apostle saith, that Tongues must cease; then that*
 “ *which makes Orthodox Men and Divine. as you say,*
 “ *must cease, according to the Apostle's Doctrine; and so*
 “ *then Tongues neither are the Original, nor make Orthodox*
 “ *nor Divine: And John that gave forth the Revelations,*
 “ *saith, that the Whore and the Beast are set upon Tongues,*
 “ *and the Everlasting Gospel must be Preached again to all*
 “ *Kindreds and Tongues, which were before Babel was,*
 “ *who was the Beginner of Tongues. Now it is clear that*
 “ *the Gospel must be Preached to all Nations and Tongues,*
 “ *and that Tongues are not the Original, neither do they*
 “ *make Divines or Orthodox Men; but it is clear, that it*
 “ *was the Word which was in the Beginning, which makes*
 “ *Divines. — By this Word are Men and Women Sanctified*
 “ *and made Clean, and this is the Word which makes both*
 “ *Men and Women Divines, &c.* — See too *Tho. Lawson's*
Mine into the Treasury, or, A Word to Artists and Hapsatech-
nists. Lond. 1703.

tiles;

*tiles ; which is Christ in you, the Hope of
 Glory.* Where the same Word *ἐν*, is used
 both with regard to the *Gentiles*, and to
 the *Colossians* ; tho' we translate it, *among*
 the *Gentiles*, and *in* you the *Colossians*. Who-
 ever understands the Original, knows, that
 it is read, *ἐν ἑσθασιν*, and translated *among*
 (and not, *in*) the *Gentiles* ; as well as,
ἐν ὑμῖν, *in* you the *Colossian* Christians. And
 therefore if it is rightly render'd, *among*
 the *Gentiles*, it is as rightly to be render'd
among you who are not *Gentiles* ; since the
 one corresponds with the other part of this
 Sentence. And the true Meaning of the
 Passage is accordingly to be fixed thus ; To
 whom [*i. e.* the *Saints* or *Christians*] God
 has been pleased to make known the Myste-
 ry of the Gospel of *Christ*, as preached to,
 or *among*, the *Gentiles* in General, and to,
 or *among* you *Colossians* in Particular, as the
 Foundation of all our Hopes of future
 Glory and Happiness. Whence it appears
 that nothing but the grossest Ignorance
 could put such a senseless Interpretation on
 the Words, *Christ in you*, as answers to the
Quaker-Doctrine of *Christ within you* : for
 it rather signifies *Christ without you*, as the
 Gospel of *Christ* is *without*, and by *external*
 Means preached unto you. So that here is
 a Fundamental Doctrine of *Quakerism* sup-
 ported by a mere *Jingle* of Words, which
 have really a quite different Sense.

LIII. p. 16. THE next Passage cited by the Letter-
 writer, in Proof of the Doctrine of *Christ*
within us, is *Galat. iv. 19. viz. My Little*
Children, of whom I travail in Birth [again]
till Christ be formed in you : Here the very
 Text is falsified by our Author, who has
 omitted the Word, *again*, in the Recital
 of it, no doubt with a Design to favour
 his Cause. But the true Meaning of this
 Passage is to be taken from the *Occasion* of
 it ; which from the former Part of this
Epistle, and indeed from this very *Chapter*,
 appears to be this ; that as some false
 Teachers had, in *St. Paul's* Absence, taught
 the *Galatians* to Judaize, and to turn again
 to the *weak and beggarly Elements*, (*i. e.* of
 the Law) and again to be in *Bondage*, and
 to observe *Days, and Months, and Times,*
 and *Years*, in the *Jewish* Manner, v. 9, 10.
 the Apostle adds, v. 11. *I am afraid of you*
lest I have bestowed on you Labour in vain ;
 as indeed he might well apprehend an entire
Apostacy : And therefore, after he had com-
 pared their former affectionate Conduct to-
 ward him with their present Behaviour in
 beginning to desert his Doctrine, v. 14, 15,
 16. he comes to the Text now in view,
 ver. 19. *My Little Children, of whom I tra-*
vail in Birth again, till Christ be formed
in you ; which is a natural and easy *Figure*,
 and means no more than that he earnestly
 desired

desired to renew the true Faith of *Christ* among them, which they had sophisticated with *Judaizing* Notions and Practices, and would in Consequence abandon entirely. And as the same Apostle elsewhere describes himself as a *Spiritual Father*, viz. 1 Cor. iv. 15. *For tho' you have Ten thousand Instructors in Christ, yet have you not many Fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel;* so here he applies the *Figure* of the other Parent, a *Mother*, to himself; which seems to have been taken from *Isaiah*, when he says, *We have been with Child.* Accordingly *St. Paul* speaks thus; *My Little Children, of whom I travail in Birth again, till Christ be formed in you.* That is, My Children of small and degenerate Faith, I labour to reduce you again, by a *second* Spiritual Birth, or Regeneration, to the true primitive Faith in *Christ*, which you have corrupted, and in effect forsaken; and till you are as it were *born again*, and the entire Doctrine of *Christ be formed in you*, I am in a sort of *Spiritual Pangs* for you. This is then nothing more than an Allusion to the Pangs of *Child-Birth*, as an Illustration of the Trouble and Pains *St. Paul* underwent, and the vehement Desire he had to restore the true Faith of *Christ* to his perverted *Galatian* Converts. So that when the *Letter-*

lf. c. xxvi
v. 18.

writer, and Others among the *Quakers*, pretend to prove from the Apostle's *Metaphor* that *Christ* is really *formed within* them, they as grossly pervert his Meaning as the *Galatians* did his Doctrine, and turn a mere *Figure* into a *proper* Signification, in as precarious a Manner, as on other Occasions they turn *proper* Expressions of Realities into mere *Shadows* and *Allegories*. How remote then is the true Sense of St. Paul, in this *Figurative* Expression, from that of *W. Bailey*, which seems to be the same with that of our *Letter-writer* in the present Citation; viz. that the *Seed within* them grows up from a *Holy thing* to a *Child given*, and a *Son born*; and so becomes *Christ*, or the *mighty God within* them, in the abused Phrases of *Isaiab.*

If. ix. 6.

But as *this* Testimony has been already
See above. cited, I refer to it. And I shall only observe farther, that as there are many *Figures* frequently used in Scripture, of which this is evidently one, the most *Literal* Interpreters of Scripture do by no means desert their professed Method of Interpretation when they explain a *Figurative* Expression in a *Figurative* manner, that is, agreeably to the Subject, without the Imputation of turning *Allegorists*, which the *Letter-writer* weakly pretends to cast upon them for so doing: Whereas the B. of *L.* and other *Literal*

Let. p. 16.

teral Interpreters, would be as justly reflected on, as the *Allegorical Quakers* are, if they at pleasure turned mere *Figures* into Realities, or Realities into *Figures*, according to the usual, but unskilful, Practice of their Writers.

BUT I go on to the last Passages of Scripture that are cited by the *Letter-writer*, to support the *Quaker*-Pretensions of a *Christ within*: viz. *John* xiv. 17, 20. *Even the Spirit of Truth, which the World cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. --- At that time [day, it should be] ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you.* Now in order to clear the Sense of these Passages, it ought to be consider'd; 1. That this was principally *I* spoke of, and immediately directed to, the *Apostles* themselves; whose Case must be acknowledged to be so very peculiar, as not to want here a particular Explanation. However, I cannot but observe, in passing, that not only the *Letter-writer*, but many of his Brethren, fallaciously misapply this and many other Texts of Scripture, relating to the *miraculous* Age of the *Apostles*, in consequence of the extraordinary effusion of the *Holy Ghost* upon them, to the ordinary *Grace* and *standing Gifts* of the same Holy

Holy Spirit to Believers in all Ages. 2. That the Holy Spirit Resided and Acted in the several Persons here spoke of in a certain *Gradation*; namely, that the *Spirit of God*, the same with the *Spirit of Christ*, was in *Christ* without measure, and resided constantly in him; but was in the *Apostles* in a certain measure of his *miraculous Gifts*, and Inspired them *occasionally*. 3. That the *H. Spirit* is in other good *Christians* by his ordinary *Illumination* and *Assistance* in a *lower* degree; that is, his *Influences* are exerted in concurrence with the use of proper *Means*, and particularly those of *Prayer*, and the Study of and Instruction in the *Scriptures*. 4. That this Scripture-account of the Operations of the *Spirit* is entirely different from the *Quaker*-Notions of *Christ within*, or the *Spirit within*; as appears from *George Fox* himself, who says, "That the *very Christ of God* is *within them*;" and sometimes he adds, "as consisting of *Flesh, Blood, and Bones*:" And *G. Lawrie* has been cited above as saying, "That they had not only the *Operations* of the *Holy Ghost within* them, but the *Operator*, or *Holy Ghost*, himself." With regard to the former of which, namely, the *very Christ of God* as appearing, or manifested *within*, (which is likewise maintained by the *Letter-writer*) it is absolutely false; since (as has been observed above) the

the true Notion of *Christ*, properly so called, is that of *God* and *Man* united in one *Person*, tho' the *Quakers* usually speak of them in a separate manner: And as *Christ* is *God-man*, it is evident he cannot at once be present in Heaven and in Multitudes of Believers on Earth; since his *Human* Nature is now confined to Heaven, tho' as *God* he is every where. And therefore he cannot be *within* us as he is *God-man*; whom, as such, it is certain *the Heaven* Acts iii, 20. must receive until the times of *Restitution* of all things, or the end of the World. And as to the latter Notion of the *Quakers*, viz. That the *Christ within* is the *Holy Spirit* himself; tho' no doubt he is every where, yet he is not the *Operator within* them, in their Sense of that Expression; for they can neither prove the *Necessity* of an *immediate* Revelation of the Will of God, without highly derogating from the *H. Scriptures*, as a perfect *Rule* of Faith and Manners; nor have they been able to produce any unexceptionable *Instances* of true *Prophetical Inspiration*; both which would be the natural Consequences of the *Holy Spirit's* Residing *within* them, in the highest and most proper Sense of that Expression. 5. That the *Letter-writer* gives an Let. p. 18. unfair account of, and grossly palliates, their *Christ within*; namely, that "They mean only, the Divine Grace, Light, or
" Spirit

p. 17.
ibid.

“ Spirit of Christ, which illuminates the
 “ Understanding, and gives a Perception
 “ and Knowledge of Divine Matters ; and
 “ that this Operates upon Mens Minds, &c.”
 And again, he stiles this Doctrine, “ the
 “ inward *Appearance* of *Christ* in the Soul,
 “ and an internal *manifestation* of his *Spi-*
 “ *rit.*” But that this is not genuine *Qua-*
kerism, is Evident from a *Comparison* of it,
 very easily made, with the *Testimonies* of
 the *Heads* of the *Quakers* above ; and that
 it is too Artful a Misrepresentation of the
 true *Quaker-Doctrine* of the *Christ* or *Spi-*
rit within, shall be farther evinced in the
Series of this *Discourse*. And accordingly, if
 the *Quakers* have all along meant nothing
 else but the *Divine Grace* or ordinary As-
 sistance, by all their *Mystical* and lofty Ex-
 pressions about the *Spirit within* them,
 they would have been distinguished by no-
 thing but mere Words from the sounder
 Part of the *Christian Church*.

INDEED the Person I am next going to
 mention, namely, *Robert Barclay*, makes a
 very great Distinction between the *ordinary*
Grace of the *Spirit*, and the *immediate*
Revelation of the same *Spirit*, which, as
 has been observed in the *Testimonies* above-
 cited out of him, he considers as the *Pri-*
mary Rule of Faith and Manners, and as
 superiour to the *Scriptures* themselves ;
 which, as he maintains, derive all their
Excel-

Excellency and *Certainty* from it. And *Let.* p. 4. since the Writer of the *Letter* to the B. of L. has said, " That the Just Rule of Judging Societies is from their received and declared Principles ; and that of these, the *Quakers* have delivered to the World a Rational System, by the Hands of Mr. *Barclay* ; which I am afraid your Lordship overlook'd in your Library, &c. " And since likewise the Author of the *Cloud* *Cloud &c.* &c. has cited *Robert Barclay's Apology* for *p. 18, 19.* some Passages that were more artfully omitted by the *Letter-writer*, I think my self obliged to add a Word or two about so eminent a *Quaker* as *R. Barclay*. And tho' no doubt the B. of L. did not overlook that memorable Author, yet he might probably think there was no manner of occasion to mention him in an *incidental* Passage about the *Quakers*, and especially since he might be of Opinion that *R. B.'s Apology* for *Quakerism* was not only the Work of a *Private* Author, not subscribed to or made Authentick by the *Quakers* in a *Body* ; (which, how much soever that Book has been spread, I do not find it ever was) as likewise that it has been so substantially Confuted by *George Keith*, in his large and clear *Answer* * to it, that (as far as I can learn)

* See *The Standard of the Quakers Examined, or an Answer to the Apology of Robert Barclay*. By *George Keith*, A. M. London, 1702. in 8vo.

not one of the *Quakers*, in a course of *Thirty* Years, has been able to publish any *Reply* to it, or a *Professed Defence* of the most plausible *System* that has been wrote by any of that Society. I therefore remit the *Letter-writer* and the Author of the *Cloud*, &c. for an Answer to their Cavils about *R. Barclay*, to his great *Master* and particular *Friend*, *G. Keith*. However, out of his *Examination* of *R. B.'s Apology*, I shall here transcribe two or three remarkable *Passages* relating to that *Apologist* for the

See Pref. *Quakers*. *G. K.* says in his *Preface*, that
 " The *Quakers* had little ground to make
 " the said *Apology* the *Standard* of their
 " Religion, when in many things of great
 " Importance *R. B.* has downright Contra-
 " dicted their *first and chiefest* Authors, as
 Ibid. " well as others of a *later Date*, &c." A-

gain; " Had the Author [intimately known
 " to *G. K.*] lived to this Day, I Charita-
 " bly think he would have renounced those
 " Errours wherewith his *Book* is chargea-
 " ble, as well as his whole *Quakerism*, &c." [And very probably indeed he had done so, in consequence of the *Detections* of *Quakerism* made by *G. K.* and in Imitation of him.]

p 506. ---And in the *Conclusion* of *G. K.'s An-*
 Ibid. *swer*, he speaks thus; " I have discovered
 " abundance in it, viz. *Barclay's Apology*,
 " (scarce one entire *Proposition* excepted)
 " inconsistent with the *Holy Scriptures*, and
 " in

" in many *weighty* things--- with other
 " *Quaker* Authors of chief Note; &c.---
 " And tho' it is more *intelligible* and me- p. 507.
 " *thodical* than any thing ever published
 " as a *System* by that Party,---yet it is ra-
 " ther, for most part, a Scheme of *refined*
 " *Deism* and *Natural Religion*, than truly
 " *Christian*." --- And how tenderly soever
 G. K. thought fit to speak of his deceased
 Friend, he adds, " That this *System*---is
 " scarcely to be called *Christian*, being a
 " composition of Principles partly indeed
 " *Christian*, but in far greater Part repug-
 " nant thereunto."---which he illustrates
 by one very proper Instance; namely, " That p. 509.
 " it was *R. Barclay's*, and indeed his own
 " [former] great Errour, in setting up
 " what we reckoned the *inward Evidence*
 " of the *Spirit's Inspiration* and Influence,
 " as the *Primary Rule*, above the *Scripture*,
 " so that instead of subjecting what
 " we thought were our *Inspirations* to the
 " *Holy Scriptures*, We subjected the Holy
 " Scriptures to what we reckoned our In-
 " spirations, and which yet were but in
 " great part our erring *Imaginations* and
 " *Fancies*; &c." With which Repugnancy
 to *Christianity* he likewise charges him, as
 maintaining elsewhere, * " That they may be p. 430.
ibid.

* See *R. Barclay's Apology*, in 6th Proposition, p. 184,
 190, &c.

“ Members of the *Catholick Church*, who
 “ have no Profession of *Christ Crucified*. ”
 p. 512. And after all G. K. says ; “ It plainly ap-
 Ibid. “ pears---that *R. Barclay* was very ignorant
 “ of the *Quakers real Principles*, even after
 “ he had so far vindicated them.” And
 indeed, besides his peculiar Notions inter-
 mixt, he wrote his *Apology* very young, and
 Died at the Age of 42.

Let. p. 3. SINCE the *Letter-writer* pretends to
 Prof. excuse *James Naylor*, whom the B. of L.
 2d Vol. had mention'd as a great Enthusiast, punish'd
 for *Blaspheming and Affronting the God of*
his Country ; and since likewise the Author
 of the *Cloud &c.* has asserted, “ That 'tis
 Cloud, “ Difficult for the B. of L. to demonstrate
 P. 31. “ what *J. Naylor's* particular *Blasphemy*
 “ was,” and has accordingly referred to
 his *Trial* ; I think my self obliged to add a
 few Words with regard to both those Au-
 thors. The *Letter-writer* speaks thus ;

See above. “ I perswade my self from your Lordship's
 “ Charity, you did not intend, by pro-
 “ ducing him, to make the Society of *Qua-*
 “ *kers* accountable for his Extravagant and
 “ Enthusiastick Actions, except they made
 “ themselves Parties, by indulging and
 “ owning such Extravagancies, which I
 “ cannot find they ever did ; but on the
 “ contrary, shew'd such dislike and detesta-
 “ tion, as were necessary, to such his extra-
 “ ordinary Pretensions, which was a suffi-
 “ cient Bar against any Imputation on
 “ them,

" them, &c." The Author of the *Cloud* A Cloud.
 says too; " The *Quakers* then Testified a- p. 32.
 " gainst his Delusions, and he himself af-
 " terwards condemned them, with repeat-
 " ed Tokens of sincere Repentance: And
 " therefore We think it Charity to cover,
 " rather than expose or aggravate the Frail-
 " ties of a Christian Penitent." But how
 weak an Apology this is of each of the De-
 fenders of *J. Naylor*, will appear by the
 Consideration of what he acknowledged in
 his *Trial* as compared with the *Sentence* pass'd See Trial,
 upon him. With regard to the latter, p. 14.
 When he was asked by the Magistrate, London.
 " Art thou the Everlasting Son of God?" 1656.
 He answer'd thus; " Where God is mani-
 " fest in the Flesh, there is the Everlasting
 " Son, and I do witness God in the Flesh;
 " *I am the Son of God, and the Son of God*
 " *is but one.*" Again to the Question, " Art p. 15 Ibid.
 thou the *Everlasting Son of God*, the King
 of Righteousness? He answer'd, *I am, &c.*
 And with regard to *J. Naylor's* subsequent
Repentance for his profane Burlesque of
 our B. Saviour's Entrance into *Jerusalem*,
 by the *Hosannas* of his own Entrance into
Bristol, as carried on with a grave Abuse
 of *Scripture-Language*, (of which a full
 account is given in the *Quaker's* own *His-* In 1657.
tory of him and his *Trial*) it is too *Super-*
ficial a Recantation to Answer to the Au-
 thor of the *Cloud's* account of him; and the

See Les-
ley's Ap-
pend. to
2d Defen.
N. 4 p.
350, &c.

Fact is too well proved with regard to G. Fox's Defence of him, before the legal Sentence was pass'd upon him (as I have Observed above) to admit of the Reasons offer'd by either of the B. of L. Adversaries. For as to G. Fox's subsequent Condemnation of him, that is, after he was grown Odious to the Publick by the Sentence executed on him, there is no Reason to wonder at it; and more especially, when

See Tryal, J. Naylor had said at his Tryal, (upon a particular Provocation) that "G. Fox is a Lyar, and Firebrand of Hell." As to

Let. p. 3. the former Author, the Letter-writer's Pretensions on this occasion, namely, "That the same Mistakes may be found in Writers of the Church of England as amongst the Quaker-Writers; and that the Quakers are not accountable for the Enthusiastick Actions of J. Naylor;" This is an Apology that is entirely foreign to the present Business; since there is a great Disparity in the two Cases propos'd: For (as has been hinted above) Errours may be excus'd with a better Grace, on the Principle of Human Frailty, in Writers that are confessedly fallible, than in those that pretend to be infallible, and to have what they speak or write dictated immediately by the infallible Spirit of God, and in the Name of the Lord. So that this Apology for J. Naylor is insignificant and of no force,

since

since he pretended to *immediate Revelation*,
 and indeed to be *Christ* himself; and he
 accordingly accepted of Divine Worship, as
 having *Christ* within him; upon a *Princi-*
ple, which, if valid at all, will excuse the
Idolatry even of the *Heathen* World. And
 therefore, unless the *Quakers* will give up
 their *Infallibility* and *sinless* Perfection, *J.*
Naylor's subsequent Sorrow, which is in-
 consistent with those High Pretensions, is
 not to be admitted in him or them, tho' it
 be so in all Others. And indeed the *Pa-*
pists themselves, who are the only Persons,
 besides the *Quakers*, that pretend to *In-*
fallibility, do not carry that Point to the
 same extravagant height. For they do not
 place it in every Particular Person of their
 Communion, but in the Pope, or a Gene-
 ral Council, or the Church diffusive. The
 Plea too of the Majority of the *Quakers* is
 most notoriously a false Consequence;
 namely, that because they pretend to have
 a *Spirit* within them that is *Infallible*,
 they themselves always have the *Infallibility*
 of it: Tho' it must be acknowledged that
 others of them, and particularly *W. Penn*
 as cited above, who have maintained the im-
 mediate Operation of the *Spirit* within them,
 have not therefore pretended to be always
Infallible. Indeed, the groundless Pretence
 of *Infallibility* is equally an Obstruction to
 Reformation of Doctrines among the *Pa-*
pists

pists and the *Quakers*. If this were removed in the Church of Rome, those of that Communion would undoubtedly Reform many confessed Abuses and Corruptions. And if this were removed among the *Quakers*, they too would surely Reform many *Unchristian* Errours, that have been introduced by their *Founder* and the *Heads* of their Party. But the *Quakers* not only agree with the *Papists* in supporting their *Infallibility* and their ancient Errours, but, like them too, go on to Palliate and Disguise their Doctrines in an artful manner; namely, in the very same way that was used by the famous Bishop of *Meaux*, in his insincere and false *Exposition of the Catholick Faith*, so laudably detected by the present Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, and other Learned Divines of our Church, in the Dispute about truly *Representing*, and *Misrepresenting*, Popery. And I cannot but Observe on this occasion, that there was another *Cloud of Witnesses*, as Dark as that in our immediate View, introduced in that Critical Juncture by the Apostate *Selater*, which was soon Dispersed by several learned Hands.

p. 31.

INDEED I had here almost forgot the slight Pretence of the Author of the *Cloud*, as mention'd above, viz. That 'tis Difficult for the B. of L. to demonstrate what *J. Naylor's particular Blasphemy* was; and he

he has accordingly Referr'd to his *Trial*. But it is surprizing he should Refer to that *Trial*, out of which the *Blasphemous* Words of *J. N.* have been already cited; namely, his assuming the Character of *the Everlasting and only Son of God*, and for which *horrid Blasphemy* in particular he was condemned, by no less Authority than that of *the House of Commons*. And as for the other Expression of the B. of *L.* about him, it is the very Question which *Cromwell* himself is said to have put to him; namely, *How he durst affront His God, and the God of his Country?*

AND of this Art of *Palliating* the more ancient *Quakerism*, we have an egregious Lond. Instance in Mr. *Arscot's* late *Considerations* 1730. *about the present State of the Christian Religion*. 1731. In which, tho' he has acted a more ingenuous Part than many of his *Quaker-Brethren*, in acknowledging the *Facts* relating to *Jesus Christ*, as a Proof, in some measure, of the *Truth* of the *Christian Religion*; yet has he put a slur on that Proof, in not making it the *principal* Argument for *Christianity*; but, instead of doing so, has appealed to the *Testimony* of the *Spirit* and an inward *Experience* of its Operations, as the *Principal Evidence* of the *Truth* of the *Christian Religion*. And on this *internal* Proof he plainly lays the greatest *stress* of the *Christian Cause*. Now if this be an uncertain Proof, he has at the same time

See Part 1.
passim.

Palliated the old *Quaker*-Pretensions by his acknowledgment of the *Facts* of the *Outward* Christ, and weaken'd the most solid Proof of *Christianity*, namely, the matters of *Fact* that establish it, and has placed it on a Dubious Bottom and Weak Foundation. For the *Testimony* of the *Spirit within*, with regard to it as an *Evidence* of *Christianity*, may possibly be downright *Enthusiasm*, and the mere work of *Imagination*. And tho' *Experience* is pretended, it is not easy to distinguish the Operations of the *H. Spirit* from those of our own Mind. *Sanctification* indeed by the *Spirit* is acknowledged by all true *Christians*, and particularly is so in the *Liturgy*, *Articles*, and *Homilies* of the Church of *England*; as well as in their great Original, the *New Testament*. But since, according to the Doctrine of the Leading *Quakers*, the *Spirit*, or Christ *within*, is *universal*, and belongs to *Heathens* in common with *Christians*; and since some of those *Heathens* are allowed to lead good and pious Lives, it is evident that such an *inward Experience* cannot be a proper Proof, and much less the *Principal Evidence*, of the *Truth* of *Christianity*; since such an *Experience* is common to Moral *Heathens* and *Christians*. For, notwithstanding the *Piety* and good *Morals* of Conscientious *Heathens*, they may justly be supposed to be entirely ignorant of *Christianity* and the *Facts* that support it.

And

And therefore the great distinguishing *Facts*, that relate to *Christianity*, are the principal Evidence of the Truth of it, and most firmly establish it; which the inward Testimony of the *Spirit*, or the pretended Experience of *Christ within*, is far from doing, and indeed is a very precarious Proof.

For if we consider the Testimony of the *Spirit*, with regard to its being a Proof of the Inspiration and Authority of the Scriptures, or of their right Interpretation, agreeably to the Pretensions of the *Quakers*, it will be evident that it is a weak and absurd Proof of the Truth of *Christianity*. As to the Inspiration of the Scriptures, it is to be consider'd as a *Fact* in Question, and therefore is to be Proved by proper Testimonies of a *Fact*, which can be only External; namely, the Declared Sentiments of the Primitive Christians, and the constant Tradition of the Catholick Church for near Seventeen Centuries. After so many Ages, the Pretence of the *Spirit within* to prove an ancient *Fact* comes surely too late, and indeed is highly unreasonable in its own Nature; unless it be Confirmed without by Miraculous *Facts*. And as to the Interpretation of the Scriptures, as supposed to be made Authentically by the *Spirit within*, and without regard to the Proof of external *Facts*, as the old Leading *Quakers* pretended; it is plainly *Enthusiastical*, and without any Foundation. I will briefly illustrate this Mat-

ter by a remarkable Instance, viz. the Proof of the *Resurrection of Christ*. It appears from the *Testimonies above*, that some Leading *Quakers* have declared that they did not believe that most important Fact, because *St. Paul* and the other *sacred Writers* asserted it, but *because it was witnessed to them within by the Spirit*. Which is, in effect, to give up the *Testimonies of the Senses of the Apostles*, and particularly those of *St. Thomas*; and to resolve the Proof of it entirely into the *Testimony of the Spirit within*, which may be merely *imaginary*, and wants it self another Proof, namely, that of *outward Miracles*.

See *Con-*
siderations
&c. C. 1,
2.

p. 1-8.

ibid

BUT tho' what is now said holds strongly against the more ancient *Quakers*, and the majority of their *Writers*, who have highly derogated from the *Facts* relating to an *outward Jesus*; (as fully appears from the *Testimonies above*) yet it must be confessed that *Mr. Arscott* has plainly acknowledged the *Reality* of those *Facts*, which he calls the *External Historical part of Christianity*; and has wrote in behalf of the *Prophecies* as fulfilled by *Christ*, and the *Miracles* that were performed by him and his *Apostles*, as two great *Evidences* of the *Truth* of *Christianity*. But tho' this be acknowledged in favour of *Mr. A.* yet that he is in the wrong, and dangerously so, in laying a much greater stress on the *inward Testimony of the Spirit*, which he

calls

calls the *internal experimental part* of Christianity, than upon the *Facts* relating to it, that is, as the *Principal Evidence* of the Truth of it; will appear from the following Considerations.

1. *The Christian Religion* originally and immediately relates to *Jesus of Nazareth* as *without*; namely, the great Point was at first, and now is, whether he is the *true Messiah*, and answers to the distinguishing Characters of that Person. And though it be acknowledged by Mr. A. that he does so, yet he inconsistently supposes that the *Spirit* leads us to the Proofs *within* of *Jesus's* being the *Christ without*, as the *Principal Argument* for Christianity. Now this cannot reasonably be supposed: for the Scriptures plainly lead us to an *outward Christ*, and Mr. A. chiefly to an *inward One*, in Proof of the *Truth* of his Religion. And consequently, this is so great and general a *Prejudice* against Mr. A.'s *internal Evidence*, that the Truth of the *Facts* relating to *Christ*, ought, agreeably to the Scriptures, and indeed to the Reason of the Thing, to be consider'd as the *Principal Evidence* of his Religion, whatever we determine about any *Evidence* that arises from the Testimony of the *Spirit within*.

2. Mr. A. labours to prove that the *Quakers* have now the *immediate Revelation* of the *Holy Spirit*, and that too as the *principal Evidence* of Christianity, from those

C. iv. v.
ibid.

those *Texts* of Scripture which peculiarly belong to the *Miraculous Gifts* in the *Apostolical Age*. And that some of those *Texts* are wrong applied by him to the *Operations* of the *Spirit* of God in *After-Ages*, in order to avoid a long *Dissertation* on them, not at all suitable to this Place, I shall only Refer to *Galat. Ch. iii. 2, 3, 5.* and *Ephes. Ch. i. ii. iii. 20, &c. iv. 7, 8, 11. v. and 1 Cor. Ch. ii. iii. xii.* as compared together; where, among the *Gifts* of the *Spirit*, the *Donatives*, *Miracles*, are mention'd as a *Principal Part*; and, consequently, do not belong to the *present Operations* of the *Holy Spirit*, which on that Supposition must be *Miraculous*; a Supposition, which is more, I think, than Mr. A. or his Brethren make Pretensions to; or if they do so, they must support those Pretensions by *outward*, and not *inward*, and invisible, *Miracles*.

3. NOT only those *extraordinary Gifts*, in the Age of the *Apostles*, are confounded by Mr. A. with the *ordinary Grace* of the *Spirit*, as necessary to *Sanctification*; but that *Sanctification*, and the *Experience* of it, are precariously said by him to prove the *Truth* of *Christianity*, and that too as the *principal Evidence* of it. For the *Experience* of *Sanctification*, that is, in other Words, of *Piety* and good *Morals* consider'd as *Habitual* in Men, cannot justly be supposed to prove the *Truth* of *Christianity*; See above, since (as is insisted on by the *Quakers* in their

their *Confession of Faith* Recorded in *Sewel's History* of *Heathens, Mahometans, and Jews*, may be Men of Piety and good Morals; who notwithstanding, as they are of those Denominations, cannot, with any Propriety, be said to embrace *Christianity*. So that what belongs in Common to *Them* and *Christians*, namely, Piety and good Morals, cannot possibly be a *Criterion* of the *Truth* of *Christianity* to *Christians* themselves.

4. SUCH an *Experience* of *Sanctification*, or of Piety and good Morals, may arise from the *ordinary Grace* of the *Spirit*, as being of it self sufficient to produce them, in Concurrence with our own sincere Endeavours to be good and virtuous, in a due Use of all proper *Means*. Surely the *Grace* of God was never wanting, in some Degree, to favour those, in any Age of the World, who exerted their hearty Endeavours to be good and virtuous. And therefore such an *Experience* of a *Divine Aid* as is so much laboured by Mr. A tho' it be acknowledged by all good *Christians*, is too weak to bear the Weight of the whole *Christian Cause*, and to be the *Principal* Foundation of the *Truth* of it; of which *Ordinary Grace* can be no just *Criterion*, tho' it be allow'd that *Divine Grace* is now *Federally* given to *Christians*, which has been more arbitrarily distributed to *Others*; on a right Use of which no doubt it would be farther improved by Both.

5. THO'

5. THO' it is acknowledged that good and holy *Precepts* are a great *Advantage* to the Cause of *Christianity* as an *Excellent System*, yet they do not strictly demonstrate the *Truth* of it, either in themselves, or in their Influence on the Lives of Men. For a good *System* of *Morality* may be supposed to be formed without *Divine Revelation*, and its reasonable *Precepts* may likewise be allow'd to have an Influence on the Minds of some well-disposed Persons, tho' not on the corrupt Bulk of Mankind; and that, with regard to the *Quakers*, on their own Supposition of the *Universality* and *Sufficiency* of the *Light within*; and with regard to *Others*, for the last mention'd Reason.

6. Mr. *A.* cannot be secure, upon his Principle, from being imposed on by *Fancy* and *Imagination*, instead of the immediate Revelation, and inward Sealing or *Testimony* of the *Spirit*, unless it be attended with *Miraculous Effects*, as in the *Apostolical* Age. And therefore an Argument that is subject to so much *Uncertainty* as the inward *Testimony* of the *Spirit* is, abstractedly from other Considerations, is no firm Proof of the *Truth* of *Christianity*, and much less the *principal Evidence* of it.

7. AN *Experience* of *Sanctification*, consider'd as a *Criterion* of the *Truth* of *Chri-*

Christianity, puts the *Christian* Cause not only on a very precarious but a *Narrow* Bottom, as it is an Argument that labours under a particular Defect; namely, that whatever may be pretended to be felt *within*, as an Effect of the Operations of the *Spirit*, cannot be proved to Others *without*, who may doubt of it; since they can Judge of nothing but what is visible, and what may not arise (as has been intimated) from other Principles: And consequently, such an inward *Experience* of *Sanctification*, as is pleaded for, cannot possibly be the *principal* Evidence of *Christianity*, as being confined to the Breast of him that *Experiences* it.

8. SUCH an *Experience within* cannot be a *Criterion* of the Truth of *Christianity*, since it may be equally pretended to by a Person who is not a *Christian*; for instance, by a *Mahometan*, in favour of the Truth of the *Alcoran* it self, if that *Mahometan* be supposed to be a Person of Piety and good Morals; and such a Supposition is not unreasonable: And therefore, an Argument, which being admitted would prove the Truth of the *Mahometan* Religion, cannot possibly be supposed to be the *principal* Proof of the Truth of *Christianity*. But I shall not enlarge on this Head, as having already touched upon it in the Case of *Heathens*.

9. THERE is no more Force in Mr. A.'s *Confid.* 1
Argument that it is *necessary* there should
be 50, &c.

be such a Proof of the Truth of Christianity as arises from inward Experiences, for the sake of plain and ignorant Persons, than that there should be Infallibility in the Church of Rome, which is equally pretended by those of that Communion to be necessary for plain and ignorant Persons. And indeed a pretended Necessity in the Case is of no Weight on either Side.

Lastly, IT is the Result of the whole, that since the Argument of an inward Experience of Sanctification, or a prevailing Sense within of Virtue and Piety, is liable to such Defects that Christianity cannot possibly be proved by it, and much less founded on it as its principal Evidence, it is injurious to the Christian Religion to appeal, for the Truth of it, to what is of so uncertain a Nature; and not to lay the greatest Stress on the most solid Proofs of it, and its Principal Evidence, namely, those Matters of Fact which establish the Truth of Christianity.

I CONFESS I cannot forbear to add on this Occasion, that, notwithstanding the Mistake Mr. A. has committed in laying too great a Stress (as has been shewn) on the Inward Testimony of the Spirit, and a Personal Experience of it in its Effects, as the Principal Evidence of the Truth of Christianity, I see with Satisfaction that some Reformation is made among

among some of the *Quakers*; namely, a plain Acknowledgment is made by Mr. A. of the *Facts* that relate to *Jesus Christ* consider'd as *Proofs*, in some Measure, of the Truth of his Religion; as likewise a greater *Respect* than formerly is paid by them to the *Holy Scriptures*: a Reformation, which seems to be very much owing to *George Keith's* Doctrine, as gradually carried on, tho' in a silent and imperceptible manner, even after the pretended Extinction of his Party. However, I cannot dissemble my real Sense of the Argument taken from the *inward Testimony* of the *Spirit* that has been now consider'd, and on which so much *Weight* has been shew'd to be wrong laid in the Proof of the Truth of *Christianity*, as compared with that drawn from Matters of *Fact*. I mean, I am apprehensive that this is no more than an Artful Disguise of what *G. Keith*, whilst he professed himself a *Quaker*, maintained in his Book intitled, *Immediate Revelation of the Will of God not yet ceased*; (which indeed upon this Subject seems the best Defence of *Genuine Quakerism* that is extant) as likewise of what Mr. *B. Lindley* Published, has more lately defended in his *Necessity of Lond. Immediate Revelation, &c.* 1710. So that though Mr. A. pretends to say (as likewise does the *Letter-writer*) that no more is meant by the *Quakers* than a *Divine Aid*, or the ordinary *Grace* of God's *Holy Spirit*,

it is not uncharitable to entertain some Suspicion of Artifice on this Occasion ; since not only *Texts* have been cited for that *Divine Aid*, or the *ordinary Grace* of God, which properly belong to the *extraordinary Gifts* of his *Spirit* ; but it is evident from the *Testimonies* above, that all this is a Misrepresentation of the *Quakers* more *ancient* Doctrine, which cannot but be consider'd as inconsistent with the new Pretensions of Mr. *A.* to which more *ancient* Doctrine the *Quakers* have Declared, both in a publick and private manner, that they *still adhere*.

It is therefore necessary in these Dubious Circumstances for the *Leaders* of the *Quakers*, who have of late wrote more decently about an *outward Christ* than their Predecessors did, to *Retract*, in an ingenuous manner, the *Unchristian* Errours of their Predecessors ; and I do not use that Word precariously, since that they are *unchristian*, is evident from the Quotations above out of their own Writings. And good Reasons are very obvious for such a Publick *Retraction* ; namely, that They seem to act an insincere Part in writing at present in a manner *contrary* to their more *ancient* Doctrines, whilst they assert that they *still adhere* to and really retain them ; and consequently, that they at present Delude their People by wretched *Evasions* : They now pretend to maintain the
 Doctrine

Doctrine of an *outward* Christ, and to believe the *Facts* relating to him as part of the *Proofs* of the *Truth* of the *Christian* Religion, and yet they defend and adhere to the *inconsistent* Doctrines of their Predecessors, and thereby make themselves *answerable* for them. So that both in *Vindication* of their own suspected Sincerity, and in order to prevent the pernicious Mistakes of the Body of the common *Quakers*, they will do well to consider what is their Duty on this occasion; and a fair Opportunity of doing so will occur at their Approaching *Yearly Meeting*. For the rest of the World, that think impartially, are of Opinion that their *Leaders* ought no longer to recur to poor Evasions, and unfair Subterfuges, by way of *Reconciling* the Contradictions of their Opinions, as professed at present, with their more Ancient ones, in the disingenuous manner of *Jos. Wyeth*, so unanswerably exploded by Mr. *Lesley*; since, (besides the fore-mention'd Reasons) such a *Reconciliation*, however labour'd, is really an *impracticable* thing. But if they are *sincere* in their present Profession, and do not use unjustifiable Artifices, it would be more worthy of their boasted *Simplicity*, and better become the *Integrity* of true *Christians*, to disown and condemn by some *Publick Act* the *Errours* of their Predecessors, as specified in the Citations of them *above*.

O

And

And indeed till they do so, it is by no means Uncharitable to believe they impose on the Publick by Equivocal Expressions and Mental Reservations. In short, if they publickly *Retract* the fore-mention'd *un-christian* Tenets of their *Leaders*, they must resolve to sacrifice their pretended *Infallibility*; but tho' this may seem the chief Difficulty of a *Retraction*, surely it ought to be given up, when it is balanced by the character of *Insincerity* if they do not give it up. And whether a farther Delusion of the People by *nominally* contradicting, and yet *really* retaining their former Errors, be capable of any Justification, must be left to the Consideration of the World as well as to their own Consciences. They likewise will do well to Recollect, whether their Refusal to Renounce Old Errors, in a Publick manner, can be any Inducement to the World to think that they really perform those *Conditions* which Qualify them for their *Toleration*; which, as I am well assured, is not Envid them by the B. of L. and they will best shew they deserve it by a Condemnation of their *Ancient* Doctrines that are inconsistent with it; and more especially, it will be proper for them to shew they have made a good Use of Old Favours of the *Legislature*, before they expect to have any New ones. Indeed I would be far from imposing the Penance of such

a Publick *Retraction* of ancient Errours on the *Leading Quakers* at present, and they might be Connived at in silently and gradually Changing their Opinions, if they did not make themselves *Answerable* for their Old *Unchristian* Doctrines, by Declaring solemnly from time to time, that they still adhere to them, and therefore must think themselves obliged to inculcate them occasionally on their deluded People. For if They now adhere to their *Old* Doctrines, whilst they actually lower and sink all the great and sublime Things they have formerly said about the *Light within* them into a mere *Divine Aid*, or the *ordinary Light* of the *Spirit*, as is shewn to be done by Mr. A. this is indeed a new sort of *Occasional Conformity* to the Belief of the *Facts* relating to *Christ*, and at the same time to that Doctrine of *Divine Grace*, which is common with them to all Others that pretend to the Name of *Christians*; but they still retain a Loop-hole and Reserve for their more Ancient Doctrines, to which, upon proper Occasions, and as a *Salvo* of the Honour of their Society, they may think fit to recur. But this is a false piece of *Honour*, and therefore ought to be abandoned by Men of Probity and Conscience.

If it be said on this occasion, that I, as a *Vindicator* of the B. of L. Obstruct by
O 2 the

the Proposal of a *Retraction* the Return of the *Quakers* to true *Christianity*, which is carrying on by their own gradual and silent Alterations of their more *ancient* Doctrines; I Answer, that I am far from doing so, as likewise I am perfectly satisfied is the B. of L. For what is now published is with an intention to invite, and bring back, the *Quakers* to genuine *Christianity* in general, and to the best and soundest part of the Catholick Church, the Church of *England* in particular, by undeceiving them both as to their *ancient* Doctrines, and their present *Disguises* of them. But what I aim at here, is not only to perswade them that the most erroneous Persons among them will be received into the *Christian* Church with open Arms, but that such their Reception ought to be well founded; I mean, on a Demonstration of their *Sincerity* on that occasion; which can only be proved by Disowning and *Condemning* publicly the foremention'd *un-Christian* Testimonies of their Predecessors.

AND indeed I insist on such a *Retraction* with a more particular Concern, because Mr. A. has not only Obscured the *Light within*, and levelled it with a *Divine Aid* or the *Common Grace* of the Spirit, but has Declared that the *Experience* of that *Common Grace* in the *Sanctification* of *Christians*

Christians is the *principal Evidence* of the *Truth of Christianity*. For, as has been already shewn, such an *Experience* cannot possibly bear so great a *Stress* as is here laid on it; unless what has been maintained by the Leading *Quakers* be given up; namely, that good *Moral Heathens*, who according to them have the *Light within*, and therefore have that *Common Grace*, have likewise *within* them the *principal Evidence* of the *Truth of Christianity*; and consequently, are to be consider'd as *Christians*, and capable of *Salvation* as such, even whilst they are *Heathens*. But surely such a Supposition destroys itself, and is too absurd to be admitted, and especially by a Person of so good Sense as Mr. A. who has had the Benefit, unusual among the *Quakers*, of a *Scholastick* Education; and therefore must be presumed both to see and abhor the *Consequences* of it, upon a due Reflection on them. And I mention this with the greater Freedom, as Mr. A. not only writes more intelligibly and rationally than most of his *Society*, but with a more decent and *Christian* Spirit, and with the appearance of some Concern for the Preservation and Honour of the *Christian Religion* among us; and therefore as a Person capable of Conviction in what seems to be erroneous in his Way of Thinking, and more especially

as He himself expressly desires to be set right if he is in the wrong.

AND since the old Sett of *High Quakers*, such as *Fox*, *Penn*, and *Whitehead*, are long since gone off the Stage of Life; and since it is to be hoped there are not many now left, among the Leading *Quakers*, of the rigid *Foxonian* Party, at least among the *Writers* of that Society; and since likewise it has been now proposed that in order to vindicate their Sincerity, and demonstrate the reality of their Reformation, it is become their Duty to disown and *Retract* the Errours of their Predecessors, by their presumed adherence to which they make themselves *Answerable* for them; that this Proposal of a *Retraction* may have the greater Weight and Influence upon them, or at least those among them who have embraced the *lower* sort of *Quakerism*, I shall now recommend to their Imitation the Examples of two of their greatest *Leaders*, in *Retracting* and *Condemning* several of their *ancient* Errours, namely, the free Acknowledgments of *W. Penn* and *Rich. Claridge* not long before they left the World, or were render'd incapable of making a farther Progress, as they have been lately Attested by a *Living Witness*; whose Name is subscribed below, and who was for many Years one of their *Society*, and indeed one of their *Elders* and *Overseers*, but

at

at last was Converted, upon better Information, to the Church of *England*, and accordingly has given the following Account from his Own Conversation with the two fore-mention'd *Leaders*; who were really Persons of more *Learning* than is usually found in their Society.

“THE occasion of the Conference I had with *William Penn* in the time of his Confinement within the Rules of the *Fleet*, about twenty Years ago to the best of my Remembrance, was to request his Opinion concerning certain Incoherences in Doctrine, Discipline, and Practice, I had observed amongst us; (since particularly published amongst several others, under the Head of *Inconsistency* in my Book stiled, * *A Charge &c.*) with relation whereto he having previously perused Mr. *Lesley's* several *Defences* of his Book, entitled, *The Snake in the Grass*, against G. *Whitehead's* and *Jos. Wyeth's* several *Answers* to it, together with *George Keith's Answer* to *Robert Barclay's Apology*, &c. as I was credibly informed afterwards, very cordially gave me his Opinion as follows: That tho' he owned all those Inconsistencies I men-

* See *A Charge of Error, Blasphemy, Infidelity, &c. on the Leaders of the Quakers*, by Henry Pickworth, Lond. 1715. 8vo. As likewise his *Letter to the Quakers*, Lond. 1730.

"tioned were the unhappy Effects of di-
 "vers *very great Errours* we had been ex-
 "posed to, by taking Things upon Trust
 "from some unqualified Pretenders a-
 "mongst us, as Persons *peculiarly Inspired*
 "above others for our Directors; yet he
 "sorrowfully declared to me, that there were
 "several others of a much higher Nature,
 "that he was made sensible were of a far
 "worse Tendency with relation to our eter-
 "nal Salvation, which had been as indus-
 "triously promoted by him and others as
 "true *Christian Verities*, for want of due
 "Examination by the *Rules of Holy Scrip-*
 "ture; the which, if the Lord gave him
 "Life, Strength, and Liberty, *he would*
 "travel through the Nation in order to set
 "Friends to rights in; with more to this
 "Purpose. Which he neglecting to do
 "notwithstanding, through the Influence
 "G. Whitehead, and one Henry Gouldney,
 "with others of his rich Quaker-Supporters,
 "had over him; (together with his own
 "uneasiness so manifestly to interfere
 "with his and their *previous Pretences*
 "to an *Infallible Guidance*) as I have good
 "Reason to conclude from some Discourse
 "I had with him *after* his Enlargement;
 "so the same was one great Reason, I'm per-
 "suaded, why God Almighty suffered him
 "to be possessed with that Spirit of Lunacy,
 "which utterly unqualified him for that
 "*Christian Service* all the time of his Life

“ after, that terminated in Rage and Mad-
 “ ness before the end of his Days at the Bath,
 “ (in which another of our noisy Preachers
 “ and Disputants made his Exit also much
 “ about the same time at Bury St. Edmund's)
 “ if I ben't misinformed, as a *Warning* to
 “ others in the like Case offending; which
 “ yet has not had that good Effect upon his
 “ *Survivors* as might have been justly ex-
 “ pected, except in the Case of their learned
 “ Friend, and once as officious Defender,
 “ *Richard Claridge*, who being (with my
 “ self, and some few others of their then ap-
 “ proved Brotherhood,) in like manner con-
 “ vinced of our Errors in most respects by
 “ the *Christian* Writings of Mr. *Lesley* and
 “ *George Keith* above-mentioned, was ob-
 “ served by the Friends to be much *Flatted*
 “ in his *Publick Testimony* to what he had
 “ been theretofore in their Assemblies: upon
 “ which one *Clutton*, an Apothecary in *Highb-*
 “ *Holbourn*, assumed the Confidence to stop
 “ him in his Preachment, by pulling him
 “ by the Sleeve for that end, before a nu-
 “ merous Auditory at the Funeral of one of
 “ their Brotherhood, under Pretence of his
 “ wanting the *Power* that was necessary to
 “ make his Doctrine effectual; which the
 “ said *R. Claridge* taking as no small Affront
 “ to one of his Eminence, highly complained
 “ thereof to their Meetings of Discipline,
 “ &c. wherein tho' he obtained some Satis-
 “ faction by their blaming of *Clutton*, yet he

" was every Day observed to grow *cooler* and
 " *cooler* in the Matters of our Profession; as
 " he further made appear by his several
 " *Bickerings* with our Preachers about the
 " *Unrighteousness* of their *Orders* against our
 " Marriage of some lawful Kindreds, in or-
 " der to have them expunged out of their
 " Books of Church-Discipline; (as appeared
 " by a printed Paper of his presented to me
 " on that Subject) wherein tho' he plainly
 " proved the said Orders *Anti-Scriptural* in
 " their own Nature, and *pernicious* in their
 " Consequences, he could by no means get it
 " effected. Which Matter having been the
 " Occasion of divers Letters between me and
 " *George Whitehead*, several Years before
 " his said *Contest* with him and his Collegues
 " of their *Second-Days-Meeting*, &c. I from
 " thence took the Liberty to make him a
 " Visit at his Dwelling-house in *Paved-Alley*
 " *St. Jone's Street*, several Months before
 " his *Bodily Dissolution*; where after some
 " Discourse betwixt us concerning the Mat-
 " ter above-mentioned, together with that of
 " our *Non-payment* of *Tithes*, *Church-Rates*,
 " and the *National Militia*, when legally
 " demanded, wherein as he *agreed* with
 " me against their *Illegal Detention*, I next
 " proceeded to request his Opinion con-
 " cerning our *Non-subjection* to such for-
 " mal *Oaths* as had been *lawfully* tender'd
 " us, in order to the terminating of Mat-
 " ters of *Strife* betwixt Man and Man in
 " Courts

" Courts of Judicature among other like
 " necessary Occasions; since he having so
 " strenuously pleaded for our Subjection to
 " their *Solemn Affirmation* as they call'd it,
 " which I would prove a substantial *Oath* by
 " Holy Scripture and our *Quaker-Friends*
 " own *Confession*, I the more wonder'd he
 " should so join with them, as he had done
 " in his several *Defensive Books*, in denying
 " those of an inferior Nature heretofore
 " imposed on us as *Unchristian*: In answer
 " whereto he told me, — That as he was
 " made sensible that *he* and *others* of our
 " Friends called *Quakers* had been led into
 " very great *Mistakes* in that Case, (as well
 " as *divers others*) thro' a Misconstruction
 " of our Saviour's and his Apostle's Words in
 " *Matthew* and *James*, &c. which he had
 " found by the Original *Greek* would bear a
 " different Sense from that of our common
 " Translation, more consonant to our Sa-
 " viour's own Explanation; so as he well knew
 " that all *solemn Appeals* to God, as an Evidence
 " of the Truth of our Testimonies, were no
 " less than Religious *Oaths* foretold to be
 " practis'd in Truth and Righteousness in this
 " our Gospel-Day, none amongst us could
 " rightly preach to our Auditors Advantage
 " without the use of them in some degree
 " or other: In Pursuance whereof he then
 " further assured me, that their new devised
 " Form they had got enacted in the place
 " of the former, wherein they solemnly,
 " sincere-

“ sincerely, and truly pretend to *Speak the*
 “ *Truth, and nothing but the Truth,* in the
 “ Matter they may be called to give Evi-
 “ dence in; as it is solemnly, sincere-
 “ ly, and truly, to *appeal* to the *God* of
 “ *Truth* as a *Witness* to their Sincerity in
 “ such Cases, is so far from being no *Oath*,
 “ as Friends have taken for granted,
 “ that he would undertake to prove it is
 “ no less than *Three Oaths* instead of that
 “ *One* in the former *Act* they had so strug-
 “ gled to get abrogated, to make Way for
 “ this their Favourite new one, to the no
 “ small Confusion of their pretended *Spi-*
 “ *ritual Discernings*: In Reverence of which
 “ Undertaking of his I suggested to him,
 “ that since I was fully persuaded that he
 “ was convinced of *this* and those *other Er-*
 “ *rors* of our old Friends we had been dis-
 “ couraging of, thro’ the Means of *Mr. Lef-*
 “ *ley’s* and *Mr. Keith’s* Books, then upon the
 “ Table before him; together with that of
 “ *Mine* in some measure, whereby he owned
 “ he had been often agreeably Diverted, by
 “ my *Comparison* of their exalted Apostle
 “ *Fox’s* Proud Assuming Pretensions with
 “ those of the *Romish Pope*, that I had ex-
 “ tracted out of his several *Books*, compared
 “ with the *Acts and Monuments*, and *Frauds*
 “ of *Romish Monks*, conjoynly considered;
 “ and since I could not see how he could be
 “ easy in his longer *Continuance* in their de-
 “ praved *Community*; I hoped that he would
 “ find

“ find himself conscientiously concerned
 “ from thenceforth to joyn with us, in
 “ pressing upon the *Brotherhood* the *Publick*
 “ *Condemnation* of such of their *Doctrines*,
 “ as they found they could not defend in
 “ those several *Conferences* *G. Keith* had ap-
 “ pointed them for that Purpose. Which
 “ *Christian Duty* tho’ he was not then so
 “ easy to submit to as I desired, for certain
 “ Reasons he then alledged, yet of this he
 “ said I might assure my self, that as *he was*
 “ *made perfectly sensible of divers of their*
 “ *Errors* *he himself* had heretofore precipi-
 “ tately defended, he would never more put
 “ Pen to Paper in the *behalf* of them, what
 “ Temptations soever might be offered to
 “ induce him to it ; wherein as he faithfully
 “ kept his Word all the time of his Life
 “ after, as I doubt not he would have done
 “ had he lived to the Age of *Metuselah* ;
 “ so in Pursuance thereof he was far from
 “ giving the least *Order* to *Reprint* his Works
 “ in *One* Volume, as the manner of their
 “ Preachers has been heretofore ; and I do
 “ not find that the *Brotherhood* hath hither-
 “ to presumed to affront his *Repentance* of
 “ the Contents thereof, by *collecting* them
 “ without it ; as they have most abusively
 “ done their once much more admired
 “ Friend *W. Penn’s* ; who, as he was, to
 “ my Knowledge, as sensible of *his own* and
 “ *their Errors* as *Claridge* was, would have
 “ been as far from allowing them that Li-
 “ berty,

" berty, had not his *Delirium* incapacitated him to grant it, the Continuance whereof to the end of his Days, as it sufficiently invalidates their future Pretensions to it in their Defences; there is not one sincere Soul amongst them that rightly considers the same, but will I hope readily joyn with me in the Condemnation of their said Audacious Presumption in offering to Collect them without it, when they could not but know as well as I, by their great Intimacy with him before it seized him, that he Repented of the Contents of most of them. Of which I cannot so experimentally Testify concerning their old Friend George Whitehead, with whom as I have had little Intimacy since we differed about their fore-mentioned Order, so I cannot offer any such Ground of Hope of his Repentance, as I have exhibited herein of the other. However, as I have not heard of any one Line he hath wrote in behalf of their Foxonian Principles since Mr. Lesley's Confutation of his pretended Antidote was published, I am not altogether without Hopes that he obtained somewhat of that Nature; (together with their Friend Elwood, for the same Reason, since Mr. L.'s Satan disrobed, in Confutation of his pretended Answer to George Keith's First Narrative, came under his Perusal;) So tho' G. Whitehead's Successors have presumed to collect

" left

" left such of his *Doctrinal Works* in one
 " Volume, in Commemoration of his nu-
 " merous Sollicitations of our Ease in those
 " Sufferings He; (under the Patronage of
 " their afore said Apostle *Fox*) as the *Wheel*
 " *within the Wheel*, had first as ignorantly
 " as perniciously exposed us to, that ren-
 " der'd us so justly obnoxious; it was with-
 " out his Consent, I charitably hope, for the
 " Reason above-mentioned: In Confirma-
 " tion whereof, as they pretend not to have
 " obtained his Encouragement to *Reprint*
 " his *controversial Books* in *One Volume*,
 " as they have done his afore said *Epistles*;
 " so they have not (that I can hear of) so
 " much as offered to attempt it. Which
 " is an additional *Evidence* to me, that he
 " also in like manner came to witness some-
 " what of that *Repentance* his afore-men-
 " tion'd Friends, *Penn* and *Claridge*, had
 " freely owned to me: God had graciously
 " granted them, through that *Discovery* of
 " their *Errors* he had been pleased to afford
 " them: Which that the rest of their Bro-
 " therhood may also come to experience;
 " who have not had such Advantages for
 " their *Christian Conversion* as those their
 " Chief Teachers obtained through the Pe-
 " rusal of those Books above-mentioned; so
 " industriously concealed from their Know-
 " ledge, as that not one in an Hundred I
 " conversed with can by me be persuaded
 " that there is any such extant against them;

" it

“ it is humbly hoped, &c. Witness my
 “ Hand, *Henry Pickworth. Lyn-Regis. Jan.*
 “ 17. 1731.”

I SHALL only Observe on this Occasion, that the *Substance* of what Mr. *Pickworth* has here *Attested* relating to *W. Penn's* and *R. Claridge's Retraction* of several *Errors*, and those of great Importance, has been already *Published* in the said Author's late * *Letter to the Quakers*. But since this *attested* Paper contains several other Particulars relating to Them, *G. Whitehead*, and other *Quakers*, which deserve to be communicated to the Publick, I thought it proper, with Mr. *Pickworth's* Permission, to lay the whole before the World.

NOTHING remains to be consider'd farther in the *Letter* sent to the B. of *L.* or with regard to the Author of the *Cloud*, &c. upon the Subject of *Misrepresentation*, but what the former has insinuated, (no doubt in order to raise the Indignation of the *Quakers* against the B.) viz. that “ they
 “ are a *great Society*, now subsisting in this
 “ Nation; and that the B. has *Misrepresented* a Society of the King's *Loyal* and
 “ *Orthodox* Subjects.” With regard to so invidious a Reflection, I know the B. of *L.'s* Sentiments so well, as to be very certain that he perfectly abhors the *Misrepresentation* of any Person whatsoever; and much more

See Lett.
 p. 6, 26,
 27.

* See Mr. P's *Letter*, p. 11. 17. Lond. Printed for J. Marshall. 1730.

that

that of a whole *Body* of Men. If the *Quakers* are sincerely *Loyal* to the present Government, I am very confident no Person can Rejoyce more heartily at it than the B. himself. And as to their *Orthodoxy*, I refer to the foregoing *Testimonies* for a Confutation of that Pretence, till the Leading *Quakers* shall think fit to *Retract* the Errours of their Predecessors. However, I cannot but observe that whether those *Testimonies* sufficiently prove the B.'s Charge on the *Founders* and *Heads* of the *Quakers*; (a Question, which is now submitted to the Judgment of the Publick) it is certain the B. could not possibly *Misrepresent* the *Body* of the *Quakers*, since (as has been observed before) he particularly excepted them, when he said, "I am far
 " from condemning the *Quakers* as *Deists*." See Pref. 2. Vol. Vindic.

AND since we are assured both by the *Private* Writers among the *Quakers*, as well as by their *Publick* Declarations, which have been specified *above*, that They entirely adhere to their *ancient* Doctrines; and likewise since *W. Penn* has informed us, that "their *Light within* does surely guide
 " them, both in reference to Religion and See G. Fox's Journal, Pref. p. 36.
 " *Civil Concerns*;" and again, since the
 * 4th *Article* of their *Creed*, presented to the *Parliament* in 1693, which relates to

* "IV. We sincerely believe and confess, — That
 " Magistracy, or *Civil Government*, is God's Ordinance,
 " the good Ends thereof being for the Punishment of evil
 " Doers, and Praise of them that do well. *Sewel's Hist.* p. 626.

See p. 91. *Civil Government*, has been Referred to
above. *above*; it cannot be improper to observe how
 See *Left*. little their Old *Leaders*, whose Doctrines
 P. 27. they Declare they have not Changed, de-
 serve the Character of *Loyalty*, to which
 they now make such loud Pretensions. For
 the true Meaning of that Word is *Allegi-*
ance, or Obedience *according to Law*, and
 agreeably to the *Constitution*. Now it is
 evident that the Leading *Quakers*, of all
 Men that pretend to be *Loyal* to the Go-
 vernment, are so unhappy as to pay the
 least Obedience *according to Law*. For
 can any Persons be justly and properly stiled
 the King's *Liege-Subjects*, who are restrain-
 ed by their narrow Principles, that are
 consequentially destructive of Government,
 from *Bearing Arms* in his Service, or from
 engaging in favour of his Cause even in
 a *Defensive War*? Or can They, with any
 Accuracy, be said to perform *Fealty* to their
King and Country, who refuse to give the
 highest Assurance possible of their *Fidelity*
 to the King, by taking that *Oath* which is
 prescribed by Law to all Faithful Subjects?
 And tho' that and other *Oaths* are now fa-
 vourably Dispensed with in their single Case,
 and *legally* converted into a bare *Affirma-*
tion; yet since it must be allowed that Men
 may Falsify their *Word* that will not their
Oath, it must likewise be allowed that the
Quakers do not, in Fact, give, and indeed
 are not capable of giving, so full and clear
 a Proof

a Proof of their *Fidelity* to the Government as other *Liege-Subjects* do, to whom *an Oath for Confirmation is an End of all Strife*. And the same Objection equally holds against them with regard to their refusing to take *Affertory Oaths* in the Decision of all Matters of Justice, and of private Right and Property. And thus likewise in the Case of *Tythbes*; Can they be properly said to be *Loyal*, who refuse to pay them in Obedience to the *Laws* and *Constitution*, which require them to do so; and that too in Opposition to an express *Proviso* in the *Act of Toleration*? Indeed with regard to *Tythbes*, the *Quakers* are so far from paying Obedience to the *Laws*, that they do not so much as practice common *Justice*; since they Refuse not only to obey those *Laws*, but likewise pretend to detain that *Tenth Part*, for which an Allowance was made in the *Original Purchase* of the Land which pays *Tythbes*, and that avowedly for the *Maintenance* of the *Clergy*. And tho' it be pretended by them that *Tythbes* are a *Levitical* Institution, yet they are well apprised that *Tythbes* are not now required upon the *Jewish* Bottom, (with which we are unconcerned) but on the foot of our *English Constitution*, that is, *Common Law*, in Concurrence with repeated *Acts* of Parliament. And consequently their Objection against the Payment of them, upon the *Jewish*

Bottom, is so very impertinent, that even *Wilkinson* and *Burgefs*, two professed *Quakers*, who have rightly placed the Payment of them on a *legal* foot, have given it up, in direct Contradiction to their *Body*. For as to the *Divine Right* of *Tytbes*, whatever Force there may otherwise be in that Argument, it is on this Occasion past over in Silence. And indeed whoever knows any thing of *ancient Christianity*, which the *Quakers* so awkwardly pretend to Revive, cannot but be apprised that the ancient *Christians* did in Fact pay *Tytbes*, besides all their other *Oblations*, when the *Christian Powers* established them by *Law*, and the *Farmers* were generally become *Christians*. So that tho' it should be allow'd that the *Quakers* pay Obedience to the mild Government of his present *Majesty*, who is the Great Executor of the Laws, (and it is hoped they will always do so) yet as they Refuse to pay Obedience to the Execution of the *Laws* in the foremention'd Instances that oppose the Constitution, they by no means deserve the Character of *Loyalty* in its greatest Latitude.

AND indeed since the *Quakers* pretend, as has been just now intimated, to the Infalible Guidance of their *Light within* in matters of a *Civil* Nature, it will by no means misbecome them to join a *Retraction* of the Illegal and Destructive Doctrines of their Predecessors in *Civil* and *Political* Concerns,

Concerns, to their Condemnation of their old *Religious* Errours. And that this additional Proposal may not be thought unreasonable, I shall here select a few *Testimonies* of some of their *Leading* Predecessors, which re-inforce the Necessity of it, out of a great Variety that might be cited.

E. Burroughs (in his Works, p. 507.) speaks thus; "As for this People, [the *Quakers*] they are raised of the Lord, and established by him even *contrary to all Men*, and they have given their Power only to God, and they cannot give their Power to any Mortal Men, to stand or fall to *any outward Authority*, and to that they cannot seek."

E. Burroughs (in his *Advice to the Parliament*) speaks likewise thus; "It was through *Ignorance* that the People subjected themselves to *Hereditary Government*, or to the Government standing in a *single Person* successively; and our Nation hath been under the Bonds of *Slavery* in this Respect, &c."

G. Fox (in his *Several Papers given forth* &c. p. 8, 9, 16.) says; "Did the *Elders* of old, in the Days of *Christ* or the *Apostles*, cry up any *King* but *Christ*, to have a King to Rule over them but *Christ*?--- Do you read that there were any *Kings* since the Days of the *Apostles*, but among the *Apostate Christians*?---For *Christ* is *King alone*.---All *Kings* and Emperours

" Emperours have sprung up *in the Night*,
 " *since* the Days of the *Apostles*, among the
 " *Antichrists*.----We know that these *Kings*
 " are the *Spiritual Egyptians*, got up since
 " the Days of the *Apostles*."

F. Howgil (in his Works, p. 5.) speaks
 thus; " Many are so Doating on the Name
 " of a *Parliament*, as tho' it were *essential*,
 " and cries up the *Privilege of Parliament*.
 " But if they will not hearken to the Voice
 " of their *Masters*, the *People*, &c."

G. Fox (To the Council of Officers, p. 7.)
 says; " Ah! what a Sincerity was once in the
 " Nation? what a *dirty nasty* thing would
 " it have been to have heard talk of a
 " *House of Lords*?"

G. Fox Jun. (in his Works, p. 87, 92.)
 says; " A *Parliament* chosen by the *Voices* of
 " the *People* are not like to Govern for God,
 " or the Good of his *People*.----We see the
 " *People* have been in great *Blindness* in
 " contending for *Parliaments* so chosen."

G. Fox (in his *News out of the North*,
 p. 20, 38.) speaks thus; " The Govern-
 " ment shall be taken from you pretended
 " *Rulers*, Judges and Justices, Lawyers,
 " and Constables. All this Tree must be
 " cut down; and *Jesus Christ* will Rule
 " alone.--- And thou *Beast*, [the *Civil Go-*
 " vernment] and *False Prophet*, [the
 " *Church*] must into the Fire. The *False*
 " *Prophet* is the Counsellor to the *Beast*;
 " and the *Beast* maintains the *False Pro-*
 " phets:

" *phets*: Both into the *Pit*, into the *Lake*,
 " and *Fire*, you must *both* go. *The Lord*
 " *both* spoken it."

THESE few *Specimens*, I think, are sufficient to determine the attentive Reader, whether he ought to entertain or reject the *Character* given of the *Quakers* by their Champion Mr. *Woolston*, who speaks of them thus; " *Quakers* are no *pernicious* Sect, but as good Friends to *human Society*, as useful Members of the *Commonwealth*, and as great Promoters of the *Peace*, *Welfare*, and *Happiness* of *Man-kind*, as any *Others*." See 1st Letter to Dr. Bennet, p. 27.

To conclude; As I have thus Erased all pretended *Stains* (viz. those of *Aspersing* the *Quakers*) in the late *Work* of the B. of L. which the Author of the *Cloud* has been pleased to stile a *commendable* one; so I cannot but again Recommend to the *Leading Quakers* the foremention'd *Retraction* of their Ancient *Errours*, in order to vindicate themselves from any *Imputation* on them; by which they will best erase the *Real Stains* they have contracted, by making themselves *Answerable* for their *Predecessors*. And as for their *Misrepresentation* of the B. of L. even whilst they have warmly vented their Complaints of his *Misrepresentation* of themselves, I am so well acquainted with his *Temper* and *Sentiments*, that I can Answer for him with some Assurance, that he not only is ready to

to forgive their *Injurious* Treatment of him, but that he shall take an uncommon Pleasure in seeing the only true *Vindication* of their *Christianity*, namely, a Publick *Retraction* of their ancient Errours, and their ceasing to give occasion for any just Distinction not only between the *Christian-Quaker* and the *Deist-Quaker*, but between their *Loyal* and *Disloyal*, that is, legal and illegal, Principles.

IN short, as the nature of their *Schism* is not Changed, but continues the very same *Unreasonable Separation* from the Established Church, tho' the *Quakers* are a *Society now subsisting in this Nation* by the Act of *Toleration*, that is, a Suspension of Legal Penalties; so it may reasonably be presumed, that the same *Unchristian Doctrines* of the Old Leading *Quakers* are *now subsisting*, and are not really Changed, tho' indeed more Artfully Disguised, if the Present *Leaders* of that Society shall decline to *Retract* and *Condemn* the pernicious *Errours* of their Predecessors, and thereby effectually Vindicate themselves from the Imputation of them; which Otherwise the World must be induced to consider as *their Own*, from the repeated Declarations of their Brethren in favour of them.

F I N I S.



ERRATA.

PAGE 16. l. 7. Dele Parenthesis. ib. l. 14. place, *the*, before, *Heavens*. ib. l. 16. d. *Interrogation-Point*. p. 30. l. ult. & p. 31. l. 1. d. *G. W.* ib. l. ult. d. *Point*. & add *Gemma*. p. 85. l. 28. d. *that*. p. 172. l. 21. read, *is*, after, *said*. p. 194 l. 3, 4. d. (*as I have observed above*) p. 210. l. 6. for, *Leaders*, read *Leading Predecessors*.

to foreign...
 one that...
 in...
 of their...
 give...
 between...
 but...
 is...
 I...
 not...
 Un...
 or...
 new...
 Y...
 T...
 of...
 ing...
 ded...
 lean...
 R...
 v...
 ted...
 p...
 W...
 O...
 their...

E. I. W. S.

Printed...
 by...
 in...